The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

SINCE our last issue there has been a General Election which confounded all the prophets and gave us the most lop-sided House of Commons in history. The Government consists of three Labour leaders—one of whom was responsible last April for a Budget that completely shirked the issue, moderate Conservatives of the Baldwin type, and Liberals of various hues. The House of Commons is overwhelmingly Conservative, and can scarcely be expected to produce anything in the nature of economy. What is not yet clear is whether there are enough Conservatives of the right to overthrow the Government if it does not foot their bill. In other words, it has not yet been discovered whether the real Prime Minister is Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Mr. Winston Churchill, or Sir Henry Page Croft. Little has been seen of Mr. MacDonald in the House so far; those who believe that he will never consent to be a *roi fainéant,* and that Mr. Baldwin has a sufficient following to outnumber the Tory die-hards, hope that a liberal policy will be followed in regard to India and to foreign politics—disarmament, reparations, international co-operation. If the Premier shows himself strong enough, with the present Parliament, to carry through such a policy, it will be an achievement almost without parallel. We are not too hopeful. How can a policy approved by Lord Snowden and Sir Herbert Samuel satisfy Lord Brentford and Mr. Churchill? And will not the latter's notorious dislike for being in Opposition impel him to use every means—the constitution of the House of Commons being the chief—to get back into office? Are there enough moderate, truly "national", representatives in the House to restrain the extremists? That is the question.

* * *

IT was extremely unfortunate that the economic crisis in our own country came to a head just at a time when the attention of our statesmen should have been centred on the Disarmament Conference and on the problem of India. A Parliament of the constitution of the new Parliament does not inspire much confidence in regard to the question of Disarmament, and there is all the more need that Christian people should bring every possible influence to bear on the House of Commons to secure that Britain's stand at the Disarmament Conference gives a lead to Europe.

In a recent number of the *New Outlook,* the journal of the United Church of Canada, a striking article on "The Present War in Europe" contained this sentence: "I cannot think of a single country

in Europe where the Churches would constitute an obstacle of the least importance in stopping a threatened conflict''. Is this really the case? The Churches have a chance to disprove it by their action during the next two months.

* * *

THE Centenary year of the Congregational Union is rapidly drawing to a close. It is to be hoped that it has generated sufficient enthusiasm in the churches to carry them through the difficult days that lie ahead. Looking back on the Manchester Meetings after two months it is difficult to judge how far they succeeded, either as a commemoration or as an inspiration. There were, of course, gatherings that were decidedly good, and some not so good. There were signs of a welcome revival of interest in theology. We belauded our fathers even while we belaboured the principles for which they stood. We spoke of the need of the world, but we seemed more concerned for the machinery of the church. And the world rewarded us by taking very little notice of what we were saying. Apart from the *Manchester Guardian* few of the daily papers so much as noticed that we were celebrating a Centenary. How different was the story at the time of the Jubilee!

Some subsequent criticisms of the Assembly were distinctly interesting. One ingenious commentator discovered a ''sharp turn to the right'' in Congregational theology, and snapshotted Dr. J. D. Jones, Dr. N. Micklem, and Professor J. S. Whale all stepping to the right together. We could not help wondering which of the three was most surprised to find himself in the company of the other two. Nor could we keep out of our minds a naughty sequence of pictures in which we saw the ''dauntless three'' drilling for a long period in the awkward squad until at last they could step to the right together. We shall follow the future of the platoon with ''discriminating benevolence''.

* * *

SOME of the articles written about the Centenary have been extraordinarily revealing. It is amazing how far from their texts even Congregational preachers can get. There have been the usual disquisitions on ''doctrinaire Independency'' and ''our traditional isolated Independency'', *i.e.*, about something which has never existed except in the minds of outside critics in the 19th and inside controversialists in the 20th century. It is quite safe to repeat a challenge and defy anybody to find in the Independent churches—in the first century, the 16th, the 17th, or the 19th—that kind of complete and self-centred isolation which is so often described. To read some Congregational accounts of Congregational life a hundred years ago one would gather two things: first, that the Independent churches had absolutely no relationship with one another; second, that they

entirely refused to co-operate with other Christians. Both these assertions are entirely without historical basis. When the Union was being formed, one who doubted the wisdom of a National Union thus emphasized the attitude of the churches to each other :

> What then are the Associations? What is our co-operation in missions? What the voluntary and unshackled interchange of services between the ministers of every part of the country? What the kind of reception of the deputations of all our benevolent societies? What the unquestioning acknowledgment of the pastoral and Church recommendations of each independent Church by all others? An isolated Independent Church ! Where does it exist? Where is there any proof of any material discrepancy of opinion or action in the Independent Churches?

And as regards co-operation with other churches, when has there been any denomination so willing as ours to unite with other Churches in the work of the Kingdom? Who took the leading part in forming undenominational Societies for home and foreign missions? The Independents. Who took the lead in forming the Evangelical and Itinerant Societies, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the London Missionary Society? The Independents. Indeed, our forefathers were so catholic-minded that for a long time they hesitated to form *denominational* Societies at all. It is greatly to be desired that people within our own circle should be sure of their facts before they venture into print.

* * *

THE suggestion has been made that it would be a good thing if Congregationalism were to revert to an old practice and establish a preparatory college to which young men preparing for the ministry could go for a year or more before they were admitted to the theological colleges. We hope that those concerned will consider the advisability of carrying out this scheme. Sometimes, with a system of competing colleges, youths are admitted whose education has been of the most scanty type. It is not long since two students were admitted to a college whose entrance examination disclosed the fact that their knowledge of English was not superior to that of a Third Form boy. Nobody wants to keep out of the ministry earnest young men who feel a call thereto and who have some prospect of becoming good ministers of Jesus Christ, but it is not fair to them or to the churches, or, indeed, to the staffs of the colleges, that they should be plunged into a college course without an adequate degree of preparation. The new Ministerial Training Committee could turn its attention to this subject with advantage.

* * *

Can it not be fairly urged against Free Churchmen that many of them take no interest in education except when controversial matters are under discussion? Do they play as big a part as they

might in the management of schools, and in co-operation with teachers? Do they strive to secure that school buildings be made fit for their task, and school teachers sufficiently equipped? When we read figures shewing the percentages of certificated teachers in the different counties, does it not suggest that public opinion in some places is amazingly slack? Why should Durham, for example, have 89 per cent of its teachers certificated, and Somerset only 46 per cent? When Cheshire has only 1.66 per cent of supplementary teachers—teachers whose only qualifications are that they are 18 and vaccinated—does Devon need to have 20.3 per cent? Can it be said that people belonging to the Free Churches are doing anything at all to secure that no new unqualified teachers be appointed?

Contrast these figures, the first for England and Wales, the second for Scotland:

Certificated teachers	73.03%;	99.85%.
Uncertificated ,,	22.0 %;	.15%.
Supplementary ,,	4.97%;	none.

Can we escape the reproach that, like the vast majority of people, we are only interested in education when it begins to show itself in the education rate? Ought not young Congregationalists to be challenged by the fact that, while our annual expenditure on defence and preparation for war is £110,000,000, that on education is only £46,000,000, or £88,000,000 if we include everything from rates and taxes? Could they not set to work so to influence public opinion that the discrepancy in equipment between the country and the city might be removed? London has 94 per cent of its teachers in elementary schools certificated, the areas under County Councils have only 57 per cent.

There is tremendous scope for the Christian Church in this field. Now that young people receive the franchise at 21 there is all the more need that they should be prepared for the privileges of citizenship—"Every kitchen maid", said Lenin, "should learn to rule the State". For this, education is needed, and the churches should not overlook their duty in this regard. To what extent are they influencing young people to take up teaching as a vocation—not as a comfortable and black-coated way of earning a living, but as a real means of service?

A remarkable little book, Miss Marjorie Wise's *English Village Schools* (Hogarth Press, 5s.), started these queries. It is a book we commend to all readers of these pages.

* * *

ANOTHER spate of books on the sex question enables us to deal with an aspect of the subject mentioned in the "Impression" of the Cambridge Conference concerning which a considerable correspondence has reached us.

We are always "put off" by a book which seems afraid to stand on its own feet. The Rev. L. D. Weatherhead's *The Mastery of Sex through Psychology and Religion* (S.C.M., 5s.) carries five name on its title-page. Mr. Weatherhead is assisted by Dr. Marion Greaves; Dr. A. Herbert Gray and Dr. J. R. Rees write Forewords, and Dr. W. F. Lofthouse an Epilogue. The book, its author says,

> has a presumptuous aim. It aims at dealing with every sex problem a man or woman is likely to meet. It seeks to combine accurate science with applied religion.

Had the aim been more modest, the treatment more scientific, and the conception of religion less narrow, the book might have been of the utmost service. As it is, we should have grave doubts, such as we have not about Dr. Gray's *Men, Women, and God,* about putting it into the hands of young people.

Mr. Weatherhead, while he says many true and useful things, is altogether too confident and slapdash for a book of this kind. He apparently accepts the possible, but as yet unproved, bi-monthly curve of periodicity of desire in women; he says (a really shocking libel, this) that

> it is rare to find a sexually awakened girl who, if unable to marry, does not comparatively soon become a victim of the habit of self-abuse;

and he asserts, with the prerogative of omniscience, that "all the time I was with the regiment not a single case of immorality occurred". It is such statements, and the fact that when he quotes he does so incorrectly (*e.g.*, p. 42), that undermines *our* confidence in the book.

On the subject-matter there are two main criticisms:

(1) Mr. Weatherhead, while advocating the use of contraceptives, follows the fashion current in some quarters in denouncing the practice of *coitus interruptus*. This method, he says, results in psychological disturbance because the process is incomplete. Is it necessarily any more complete and psychologically satisfactory when mechanical preventives are employed? That certainly is an open question. Mr. Weatherhead goes on to recommend the "safe period", while admitting that this is the time of low desire in woman. He really cannot have it both ways. If intercourse is to be the natural expression of mutual affection, it cannot be argued that it is psychologically sound to urge it when women least desire it. Feminists, we think, would be right in complaining that this is a man's book.

(2) Most important of all, there is so little of self-control in the religion presented by Mr. Weatherhead. The instincts are to be supreme. So long as husband and wife desire intercourse they are apparently to have satisfaction, without any self-restraint. Is this really the way strong characters are built up? Are we really intended to let the body thus rule? Are there no spiritual values in asceticism,

in the mutual abstinence from pleasure? We can agree with all that Mr. Weatherhead and others urge about the evils resulting from repression and an unbalanced sex-life, but far more widespread to-day than the evils of repression are the evils resulting from sexual licence, within marriage and without. Mr. Weatherhead repeatedly quotes the teaching and example of Jesus. He seems to forget that in the part of life with which he is concerned those who would follow Jesus must deny themselves even as they must in other spheres.

Mrs. Janet Chance's *The Cost of English Morals* (Douglas, 5s.) takes the argument a step further. Clericalism is the enemy; it is the Churches which have prevented the dissemination of scientific knowledge about sex and birth control, and so condemned countless thousands of people to years of misery. Mrs. Chance emphasizes the sufferings of women, especially poor women, through undesired pregnancies, and the nature of the steps they take to avoid them; she advocates the legalization of medically-endorsed abortion. With her plea for the teaching of children in regard to sex we can sympathize, but her diatribes against religion detract from the value of her book. On the crucial point, whether the use of contraceptives in the long run tends to physical and psychical health, she does not touch. It is a moot question whether the cost of the system Mrs. Chance urges will not be much greater than the cost of "English Morals".

Mr. Havelock Ellis, in *More Essays of Love and Virtue* (Constable, 7s. 6d.)—six essays which are by no means as extreme as might be expected—takes the next step, and we begin to realize where we are going. Repression is bad; experience is necessary; whether marriage has taken place or not does not matter. He says:

> At present a large majority of elementary teachers (in England nearly 80 per cent), and a considerable proportion in secondary schools, are women. Yet how many of them are encouraged by the official authorities, or even allowed, to acquire, in or out of marriage, the essential experiences of sexual pleasure and motherhood? In spite of the recent progress of science, the depths of human imbecility have not yet been plumbed.

Where all this leads may be seen in *Dawn* (Constable, 10s.) the first volume of Mr. Theodore Dreiser's autobiography, which contains 620 pages, and deals with the first twenty years of his life. It is a thoroughly interesting, but a thoroughly unpleasant book, in which the author's gifts of observation and power of narrative are amply evident. The sketches of Dreiser's family, the chapter on their dogs, and the descriptions of some of the episodes are characteristic of the author at his best. His strictures on education in general, and on Roman Catholic Schools in particular (his father was a devout Roman Catholic) are severe, though perhaps justified; of religion he has neither understanding nor sympathy. In reviewing *These*

Twelve Men we doubted how much came from observation and how much from Dreiser's imagination. In this volume, too, we have the same feeling: certainly some of these boyish experiences seem to be heightened by the novelist's brush.

And, frankly, we hope that this is generally the case, for it is a bad look-out for the world if many youths are loose in it like the one described in this volume. Mr. Dreiser, as we have already had occasion to observe, believes that man is at the mercy of "chemic forces"—is "the slave of lust" is another, and probably a better, way of describing it; prostitution is thus defined as " human and necessary", while chastity is too foolish for words.

Psycho-analysts will find the book an almost undiluted piece of exhibitionism: it is the account of a youth whose life is steeped in sex, and we are spared nothing—the writer's intimacies with girls, his self-abuse, and his visits to brothels, are all related in detail. Such abnormality is obviously pathological, and for the pathologists this narrative is not without its value.

Lest it be thought that we exaggerate, one passage may be quoted:

> The mental and physical appetites of man alone explain him. He is, regardless of ideals or dreams or material equipment, an eating, savage animal, and in youth, and often in age, his greatest appetite, sex. And from that, as I have always said, and still stand prepared to maintain, arises all that we know—implements and the industries for the manufacture of them: houses, temples, arts, travels and dreams of the world, its literature and its seekings. There is no other direct first cause for man.

Is there not a natural sequence between the teaching of ministers of religion like Mr. Weatherhead and the practice of the young Dreisers of the world? If it be invariably proclaimed that repression is harmful, if the values to be found in self-control, chastity, and asceticism are not equally emphasized, people—unmarried as well as married—are being led on the path of indulgence and moral flabbiness. We are convinced that—no doubt with the best intentions in the world—some of our guides are taking themselves and those who follow them into the ditch.

* * *

This, of course, is not saying that the Church of Christ should be silent on this most important subject. Just the reverse. These pages have always stood for frankness in regard to sex, and have frequently urged the Churches to give their people a lead. The greatest count that can be brought against the Congregational Churches of this country—it does not stand against the Congregationalists in the United States—is that here they have failed entirely to help their members, and not only so, they have failed to give any organized thought to the subject. Since Congregationalists participated in

"Copec" nothing has been done, and we know what happens while the householder sleeps. Havelock Ellis, in the book quoted above, says:

> There is, however, no longer the shadow of doubt that both the principle and the practice of birth control are now firmly established in all civilized lands, and gradually becoming accepted by every class of the community, so that before long the only matter of dispute will be concerning the best method by which it can be carried out.

This is probably not far from the truth, and the process that has been going on has caused a great deal of pain and searching of heart. From pastoral experience and from the correspondence that reaches us from ministers in every part of the country we know how urgent and how poignant is the search for guidance. Are there not in Congregationalism a dozen people—doctors, ministers, men and women of wide experience—who could meet together and speak helpfully to the people of the churches? Our silence is culpable, and it not only gives critics like Mr. Fenn (in his article within) ammunition for their vigorous attacks on organized Christianity; it perhaps justifies "free lances" like Mr. Weatherhead in stepping into the breach and doing the best they can. What is to be regretted is that such writers speak so confidently on points which doctors and scientists consider *sub judice,* and do not seem to realize the logical outcome of their proposals. Corporate thought and action might avoid these dangers.

* * *

We rarely read a book about preachers and preaching without getting help from it, and it was with peculiar eagerness that we opened Dr. Richard Roberts's *The Preacher as Man of Letters* (Dent, 5s.). All that Dr. Roberts writes is so suggestive that we make a point of reading it—even his weekly contributions to the *New Outlook.* Nevertheless, while there are things in these lectures from which every preacher could learn—its insistence on passion in preaching, thoroughness in preparation, and simplicity in style—they are far from being Dr. Roberts at his best. Perhaps the bed was too short for him—the lecture on "Strangers and Pilgrims" is remote from the general subject; certainly there is too much of other people and too little of Richard Roberts.

And one definite quarrel we have with Dr. Roberts. Why does he go out of his way to be offensive to reviewers? He writes:

> By criticism here I do not mean book reviews, for those are largely hack work and do little more than call attention to newly published books. So far they are useful. As judgments on books, they are, for the most part, unreliable and useless.

Now we should have thought it unlikely that Dr. Roberts saw "the most part" of book reviews. In any case he is quite unfair to many conscientious reviewers. The reviewer best known to us puts just as much conscience into his reviewing as into his preaching—the one

he regards as a vocation just as much as the other. If Dr. Roberts had read the proofs of these lectures with as much care as many reviewers do their job we should have been spared J. B. Priestly, Alice Maynell, Paul Elmer Moore, Crabbe Robinson, Sir Gilbert Murray, *etc.*

We should like to suggest to Dr. Roberts and to all readers of these pages that reviewers and editors deserve sympathy rather than criticism. Frequently reviewers have to work under severe limitations of time and space. Often a reviewer has to compress into 500 words a notice which he would gladly extend to 5,000. And if the reviewer's task be difficult, what of the literary editor's? Think, *e.g.*, of the amount of review space this journal can afford, and compare it with the output of an autumn publishing season. We approached with fear and trembling the books published this quarter, realizing all we should like to write and all readers would like to read about them. Here are John Wesley's *Letters* in eight volumes, about which reams could be written. Here is the two-volume translation of Troeltsch's massive *Soziallehren,* which must be left for another issue. Here are half-a-dozen books on Gandhi, there half-a-dozen on Russia, and round both groups a live topical article could be constructed. Look at that pile of biographical works—Goethe, Poe, Dreiser, Arnold of Rugby, Florence Nightingale, Lord Cave, G.B.S., John Drinkwater, Ronald Ross! Add all the theology, philosophy, history, and what not—and then say a kindly prayer for those faced with a superhuman task. To cope with the pressure on the review, and indeed all, sections we have this quarter added sixteen pages to the issue.

* * *

Is there anything new under the sun? A survey of the history of Congregationalism during the last hundred years is simply a revelation of the way in which suggestions and problems crop up as new which have been repeatedly presented previously, and this seems to be the case in every sphere of life. Last Christmas we saw some children drawing from crackers envelopes inscribed " Latest novelties". They contained celluloid [?] fishes, which moved when placed on the palm of the hand, and so revealed character! We remember these "latest novelties" thirty years ago, while the following is from the recently published selection of *Maria Edgeworth's Letters,* and dates from 1808:

> We have had the same physiognominal or character-telling *fishes* that you described to Honora. Captain Hercules Pakenham brought them from Denmark, where a Frenchman was selling them very cheap. Those we saw were pale green and bright purple. They are very curious: my father was struck with them as much, or more, than any of the children; for there are some wonders which strike in proportion to the knowledge, instead of the ignorance, of the beholders. Is

it a leaf? Is it galvanic? What is it? I wish Henry would talk to Davy about it. The fish lay more quiet in my father's hand than could have been expected; only curled up their tails on my aunt Mary's; tolerably quiet on my mother's; but they could not lie still one second on William's, and went up his sleeve, which I am told the German interpreters say is the worst sign they can give. My father suggested that the different degrees of dryness or moisture in the hands cause the emotions of these sensitive fish, but after *drying* our best, no change was perceptible. I thought the pulse was the cause of their motion, but this does not hold, because my pulse is slow, and my father's very quick. It was ingenious to make them in the shape of fish, because their motions exactly resembled the breathing and panting, and floundering, and tail-curling of fish; and I am sure I have tired you with them, and you will be sick of these fish.

* * *

It is often overlooked that the Religious Tract Society is responsible for a large amount of literature suitable for reading by boys and girls. We have received a selection of their *Annuals* for girls, boys, and younger children, all of which parents need have no hesitation in providing for their young people. They are thoroughly healthy and without any of that objectionable "piety" sometimes associated with children's religious literature. In addition, the R.T.S. does excellent service through its journal *Great Thoughts*, which has developed very considerably in recent years.

* * *

Sir,—At this season of the year it is lamentable to witness the number of sleepy and sleeping attendants at our places of worship, and amongst them many of whom we should have hoped better things. Various are the excuses which such are in the habit of making; but, I believe if they were to be closely examined they would mostly prove to be unsatisfactory. Is it possible, Sir, if the heart were rightly impressed with the importance of the gospel message (a subject of life and death to all who are within its sound), that such apathy and drowsiness would be discovered? Surely there is reason to fear that a lukewarmness exists which is hateful to God and destructive to souls! But, in order to lessen, and, if possible, destroy this evil habit, may I suggest that preachers should be careful that they do not leave any room for an excuse for heaviness? If the preacher be impressed with the value of immortal souls, and the responsibility of the office he fills, surely there will not be a cold and formal delivery of that which should quicken and animate his heart; his words will not appear to be freezing on his lips as though they concerned no one present; those eyes will not be closed which were intended to witness the visible effect of God's message on the audience; but will dart from pew to pew, accompanied with prayer that the spirit of God may go from heart to heart for the accomplishment of his great work. Wishing, Sir, to observe more well-tempered zeal in preachers, and listful attention in hearers, I subscribe myself, One of the Latter.

No. You are quite right. It was not addressed to the Editor of *The Congregational Quarterly*, but to the Editor of the *Evangelical Magazine* in 1834. Nevertheless, ——.

THE IDEA OF IMMORTALITY IN RELATION TO RELIGION AND ETHICS.

It is not easy to estimate the place which the Idea of Immortality now holds in the actual religion of English people. Certainly it is nothing like so prominent as it has been in most previous ages of Christian history. And so far as it plays a part, it is a very different part. Here as in other departments of life we find ourselves at the end of a period of reaction from the Middle Ages. The medieval scheme, still presented by the Roman Catholic Church, is entirely intelligible in its broad outlines. Universal immortality is assumed; for those who are beyond pardon there is Hell; for those who are pardonable, Purgatory; for those whose pardon is accomplished, Paradise. And alongside of these, for the unawakened soul there is Limbo. The scheme presents certain administrative difficulties. It involves, in practice, the drawing of a sharp line between the awakened and the unawakened, and again, between the pardonable and the unpardonable. But unless it be held—as in fact I find myself driven to hold—that these difficulties are insoluble in principle, it may be urged that they are soluble to omniscience, which, *ex hypothesi,* is available for the purpose.

There are many of us, however, to whom the difficulty mentioned is so overwhelming as to make the whole scheme unreal, however water-tight it may be dialectically. And I have not hesitated to speak of it in terms which indicate that sense of unreality. For the human soul is at once too delicately complex, and too closely unified, to be dealt with by any method of classification whatever into mutually exclusive groups. And how can there be Paradise for any while there is Hell, conceived as unending torment, for some? Each supposedly damned soul was born into the world as a mother's child; and Paradise cannot be Paradise for her if her child is in such a Hell. The scheme is unworkable in practice even by omniscience, and moreover it offends against the deepest Christian sentiments.

But this is a very modern reaction to it. What happened at the Reformation was very different. The doctrine of Purgatory was the focus of many grave abuses—sales of indulgences and the like. These called for remedy, and thus set moving the normal method of the Reformers—the method of referring whatever was found to call for remedy to the touchstone of Scripture. And Scripture supplied no basis for a doctrine of Purgatory. So the doctrine was not freed from its abuses but was eliminated, and the Protestant world was left with the stark alternatives of Heaven and Hell.

Now the medieval scheme, being easily intelligible as a theory, however difficult in practice, had great homiletic value. It presented

vividly to the imagination the vitally important truth of the "abiding consequences" of our actions and of the characters that we form. And this homiletic value was if anything increased at first through the simplification effected by the Reformers. There, plain before all men, was the terrible alternative. Only by faith in Christ could a man be delivered from certain torment in Hell to the unending bliss of Heaven; but by that faith he could have assurance, full and complete, of his deliverance; and that faith would be fruitful in his life and character.

But there was much to set upon the other side. The new form of the scheme gave a new prominence to Hell, and whereas the popular mind in the Middle Ages was mainly concerned with Purgatory and with ways of shortening or mitigating its cleansing pains, it was now Hell that alone supplied the deterrent influence of belief in a future life. And this, while it lasted, reacted on the conception of God. For punishment which is unending is plainly retributive only in the long run; it may have a deterrent use while this life lasts, but from the Day of Judgment onwards it would lose that quality, and it obviously has no reformative aim. And it requires much ingenuity to save from the charge of vindictiveness a character which inflicts forever a punishment which can be no other than retributive. Certainly the popular conception of God in many Protestant circles became almost purely vindictive. We can read in the protests of such writers as Shelley and Byron what sort of picture of God had been impressed on their imaginations.

> Is there a God? Ay, an almighty God,
> And vengeful as almighty. Once His voice
> Was heard on earth; earth shuddered at the sound;
> The fiery-visaged firmament expressed
> Abhorrence, and the grave of Nature yawned
> To swallow all the dauntless and the good
> That dared to hurl defiance at His throne
> Girt as it was with power.[1]

No doubt Shelley was in violent reaction, and misrepresented by exaggeration what he had been taught, in addition to using the irony of indignation in order to satirize it. Yet a caricature depends for its force on maintaining some resemblance to what it ridicules. And there are sermons of the eighteenth century which go far to justify the poet's indignant contempt.

But such conceptions could not permanently survive in the minds of people who read the Gospels. Steadily the conviction has gained ground that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be conceived as inflicting on any soul that He has made unending torment. So Hell has in effect been banished from popular belief; and as Purgatory had been banished long before, we are left with

[1] Shelley, *Queen Mab.*

a very widespread sentimental notion that all persons who die are forthwith in Paradise or Heaven. And this seems to involve a conception of God as so genially tolerant as to be morally indifferent, and converts the belief in immortality from a moral stimulant to a moral narcotic. There is a very strong case for thinking out the whole subject again in as complete independence as possible alike of medieval and of Protestant traditions. The reaction from the Middle Ages here as elsewhere has worked itself out.

It has often been pointed out that in the religious experience of Israel the hope of immortality is of late origin. In the earlier times there was an expectation of a shadowy existence in Sheol; but it was not a hope. "O spare me a little that I may recover my strength, before I go hence and be no more seen" is a prayer as far removed as possible from either the later Jewish or the Christian faith in the life to come. The hope of immortality as we understand it only dawned when faith in God as One and as Righteous was already firmly established. Those of us who believe in the providential guidance of Israel's spiritual growth will at once seek a divine purpose in this order of development, but those who start with no such pre-supposition may quite well trace a value in it which has permanent importance.

The great aim of all true religion is to transfer the centre of interest and concern from self to God. Until the doctrine of God in its main elements is really established, it would be definitely dangerous to reach a developed doctrine of immortality. Even when the doctrine of God is established in its Christian form, the doctrine and hope of immortality can still, as experience abundantly shows, perpetuate self-centredness in the spiritual life. If my main concern in relation to things eternal is to be with the question what is going to become of *me,* it might be better that I should have no hope of immortality at all, so that at least as I looked forward into the vista of the ages my Self should not be a possible object of primary concern.

For as in order of historical development, so also in order of spiritual value, the hope of immortality is strictly dependent on and subordinate to faith in God. If God is righteous—still more, if God is Love—immortality follows as a consequence. He made me; He loves me; He will not let me perish, so long as there is in me anything that He can love. And that is a wholesome reflection for me if, but only if, the result is that I give greater glory to God in the first place, and take comfort to myself only, if at all, in the second place. I wish to stress this heavily. Except as an implicate in the righteousness and love of God, I cannot see that immortality is a primary religious interest at all. It has an interest for us as beings who cling to life, but there is nothing religious about that. It has an interest for us as social beings who love our friends and desire to

meet again those who have died before us; that is an interest capable of religious consecration, and for many devout souls it has an exceedingly high religious value; but even this is not religious in itself. No; the centre of all true religious interest is God, and self comes into it not as a primary concern which God must serve, but as that one thing which each can offer for the glory of God. And if it were so, that His glory could best be served by my annihilation—so be it.

But in fact God is known to us through His dealings with us. And if He left us to perish with hopes frustrated and purposes unaccomplished, He could scarcely be—certainly we could not know Him to be—perfect love. Thus our hope of immortality is of quite primary importance when regarded both doctrinally and emotionally as a part of, because a necessary consequence of, our faith in God. There is here a stupendous paradox; but it is the paradox which is characteristic of all true religion. We must spiritually renounce all other loves for love of God; yet when we find God, or, rather, when we know ourselves as found of Him, we find in and with Him all the loves which for His sake we had forgone. If my desire is first for future life for myself, or even first for re-union with those whom I have loved and lost, then the doctrine of immortality may do me positive harm by fixing me in that self-concern or concern for my own joy in my friends. But if my desire is first for God's glory and for myself that I may be used to promote it, then the doctrine of immortality will give me new heart in the assurance that what here must be a very imperfect service may be made perfect hereafter, that my love of friends may be one more manifestation of the overflowing Love Divine, and that God may be seen as perfect Love in the eternal fellowship of love to which He calls us.

For these reasons it seems to me, so far as I can judge, positively undesirable that there should be experimental proof of our survival of death—at least of such survival in the case of those who have had no spiritual faith on earth. For this would bring the hope of immortality into the area of purely intellectual apprehension. It might or might not encourage the belief that God exists; it would certainly, as I think, make very much harder the essential business of faith, which is the transference of the centre of interest and concern from self to God. If such knowledge comes, it must be accepted, and we must try to use it for good and not for evil. And I could never urge the cessation of enquiry in any direction; I cannot ask that so-called Psychical Research should cease. But I confess I hope that such research will continue to issue in such dubious results as are all that I can trace to it up to date.

When we turn from the relation of this doctrine to Religion and consider its relation to Ethics we are confronted with a different but, as it were, parallel paradox. The expectation of rewards and punishments in a future life has certainly played a considerable part in

disciplining the wayward wills of men. And of this as of other discipline it is true that there may grow up under it a habit of mind which afterwards persists independently of it. But so far as conduct is governed by hope of rewards or fear of punishments as commonly understood, it is less than fully moral. We are probably agreed in rejecting the extreme austerity of the Kantian doctrine that the presence of pleasure in association with an action is enough to destroy its moral character; but even more probably we shall agree that if an act is done for the sake of resultant pleasure or profit, so that apart from that pleasure or profit it would not be done, it is not a truly moral act. Consequently the ethical utility of Heaven and Hell, conceived as reward and punishment, is disciplinary and preparatory only. So far as true moral character is established, whether with or without their aid in the process, it becomes independent of their support and will only be injured by reference to them.

Moreover, the utility of Hell, so conceived, is very early exhausted, even if it be not from the outset overweighted by disadvantages. For in Ethics as in Religion the fundamental aim is to remove Self from the centre of interest and concern. But fear is the most completely self-centred of all emotions, and to curb irregularity of conduct by constant use of fear may easily make this aim harder of attainment than it was at the outset. I think it is good for most people to have an occasional shock of fright with reference to their short-comings; there is no doubt that to live under the constant pressure of fear—in the sense of anxiety concerning one's self—is deeply demoralizing.

It is notorious that Kant, while excluding hope of profit from the motives of a truly moral act, yet found himself bound to postulate immortality as a means of securing that adjustment of goodness and happiness which he considered Reason to demand. I believe this line of argument to be substantially sound. But if it is, then we find that the hope of immortality is wholesome as an implicate in an independently established morality, though if introduced earlier it may hinder as much as help that establishment of morality, just as it has high value as an implicate in faith in God, though if introduced earlier it may hinder as much as help the establishment of such faith.

All that has so far been said is introductory to our positive reconstruction, and has aimed rather at clearing the ground. We shall find that the authentic Christian doctrine of the future life is free from the objections which lie against the general notion of Immortality, while it contains all which in that notion is of religious value or of ethical utility. This Christian doctrine has three special characteristics:

(*a*) It is a doctrine, not of Immortality, but of Resurrection.

(*b*) It regards this Resurrection as an act and gift of God, not an inherent right of the human soul as such.

(*c*) It is not a doctrine of rewards and punishments, but is the proclamation of the inherent joy of love and the inherent misery of selfishness.

(*a*) The Christian doctrine is a doctrine not of Immortality but of Resurrection. The difference is profound. The method of all non-Christian systems is to seek an escape from the evils and misery of life. Christianity accepts them at their worst, and makes them the material of its triumphant joy. That is the special significance in this connexion of the Cross and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Stoics teach an indifference to death; the Gospel teaches victory over it. Richard Lewis Nettleship said our aim should be to reach a frame of mind in which we should pass through the episode of physical death without being so much as aware of it. That is a splendid utterance; and yet it implies a detachment from wholesome interests and from the intercourse of friends which is a little inhuman. Surely it is true that death is a fearful calamity—in itself; and as such the Gospel accepts it; there is no minimizing of its terrors. Only its sting—its very real sting—is drawn; only its victory—its very real victory—is converted into the triumph of its victim. It is one thing to say that there is no real tragedy in the normal course of human life; it is quite another thing to acknowledge the tragedy and then to claim that it is transformed into glory.

We lose very much if we equate this hope of transformation, of resurrection whole and entire in all that may pertain to fullness of life, into a new order of being, with a doctrine of mere survival. Incidentally, though the theme is too great to be developed here, this glorious Christian hope coheres with a totally different conception of the relation of Time or History to Eternity; for it both clothes History with an eternal significance, and at the same time points to a conception of Eternity as something much more than the totality of Time; and Time becomes not so much the "moving image of Eternity" as a subordinate and essentially preparatory moment in the eternal Reality. But that fascinating and bewildering topic would require a whole Lecture to itself.

(*b*) The Christian conception of the life to come as a gift of God has affinities with the Platonic doctrine of Immortality. Plato had sought to demonstrate the inherent immortality of the individual soul. In the *Phaedo* he fashioned an argument which seems for the moment to have satisfied him. But in fact it is invalid. What Plato proves in the *Phaedo* is that the soul cannot both be, and be dead; he does not prove that it cannot pass out of existence altogether. In the *Republic* he advances an argument of which the minor premise seems to be simply untrue. He says that what perishes does so by its

own defeat; but the essential disease of the soul—injustice—does not cause, or tend towards, the decay of the soul; therefore the soul is imperishable. But there is every reason to deny the second proposition. When once the essential nature of the soul as self-motion is established, it is at least open to question whether injustice is not a negation of that quality. No doubt the wicked man may display great activity; so may metal filings in the proximity of a magnet; that does not mean that they are endowed with self-motion.

It is in the *Phaedrus* that Plato first reaches the clear conception of the soul as characterized essentially by self-motion, and argues from this its indestructibility. But not each individual soul is completely self-moved, and the argument, supposing it to be valid, as I think it is, only establishes the indestructibility of the spiritual principle in the universe, not the immortality of each individual soul. Plato seems to have accepted that result, for in the *Laws*, where we find his final conclusions, he declares that only God is immortal in His own right, and that He of His bounty bestows on individual souls an immortality which is not theirs by nature.

That this is the prevailing doctrine of the New Testament seems to me beyond question as soon as we approach its books free from the Hellenistic assumption that each soul is inherently immortal in virtue of its nature as soul. That is a view which is increasingly hard to reconcile with psychology. But psychology is still a nascent science and cannot as yet claim any great degree of deference. I do not claim that in the New Testament there is a single doctrine everywhere accepted; on the contrary it seems to me that here and there a relapse into the Hellenistic point of view may be detected. But its prevailing doctrine, as I think, is that God alone is immortal, being in His own Nature eternal; and that He offers immortality to men not universally but conditionally. Certainly we come very near to a direct assertion of the first part of this position in the description of God as "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of them that reign as kings, and Lord of them that rule as lords, who only hath immortality" (*I Tim.* 6^{16}). The only approach to an argument for a future life of which our Lord makes use is based on the relationship of God to the soul: "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto Him (*Luke* 20^{38}). And in close connexion with this saying in the Lucan version are the words, "they that are accounted worthy to attain to that world and the resurrection from the dead" (*Luke* 20^{35}). It is in consonance with this that the Resurrection of Jesus Christ is constantly spoken of throughout the New Testament as the act of God himself. No doubt St. Paul explicitly states that "We must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ" (*2 Cor.* 5^{10}) but that settles nothing, unless we make, with some followers of "psychical research", the entirely

unwarrantable assumption that the survival of physical death is the same thing as immortality. Quite clearly it is not; for a man might survive the death of his body only to enter then upon a process of slow or rapid annihilation. And St. Paul elsewhere declares that he follows the Christian scale of values "if that by any means I might attain to the resurrection of the dead" (*Phil.* 3^{11}).

Are there not, however, many passages which speak of the endless torment of the lost? No; as far as my knowledge goes there is none at all. There are sayings which speak of being cast into undying fire. But if we do not approach these with the pre-supposition that what is thus cast in is indestructible, we shall get the impression, not that it will burn for ever, but that it will be destroyed. And so far as the difficulty is connected with the terms "eternal" or "everlasting", as in *Matt.* 26^{46} ("eternal punishment") it must be remembered that the Greek word used is *αἰωνίος*, which has primary reference to the quality of the age to come and not to its infinity. The word that strictly means "eternal" is not frequent in the New Testament, but it does occur, so that we must not treat the commoner word as though it alone had been available, and when a vital issue turns on the distinction it is fair to lay some stress upon it. And after all, annihilation is an everlasting punishment though it is not unending torment.

But the stress in the New Testament is all laid upon the quality of the life to come and the conditions of inheriting eternal life. It is not to a mere survival of death that we are called, while we remain very much what we were before; it is to a resurrection to a new order of being, of which the chief characteristic is fellowship with God. Consequently the quality of the life to which we are called is determined by the Christian doctrine of God.

What is abundantly clear throughout the New Testament is its solemn insistence upon what Baron von Hügel spoke of as "abiding consequences". Language is strained and all the imagery of apocalypse employed to enforce the truth that a child's choice between right and wrong matters more than the courses of the stars. Whatever is done bears fruit for ever; whatever a man does, to all eternity he is the man who did that. Moreover, evil-doing entails for the evil-doer calamity hereafter if not also here, while for him who gives himself to the will of God there is stored up joy unspeakable.

Further, there can be no question that our Lord was prepared to use a certain appeal to self-interest to reinforce the claims of righteousness: "It is good for thee to enter into life with one eye rather than having two eyes to be cast into the hell of fire" (*Matt.* 17^{8}). But these passages are mostly connected with cases where loyalty to

righteousness involves some great sacrifice or self-mortification; they are not so much direct appeals to self-interest as counter-weights to the self-interest that might hinder the sacrifice or mortification required. And the positive invitation to discipleship is never based on self-interest. He never says, "If any man will come after Me, I will deliver him from the pains of hell and give him the joys of heaven". He calls men to take up their cross and share His sacrifice. To those who are weary and heavy laden there is the promise of rest; but the general invitation is to heroic enterprise involving readiness for the completest self-sacrifice, and concern for the mere saving of the soul is condemned as a sure way of losing it.

We are called to fellowship with Christ, in whom we see the eternal God. It is fellowship with Love, complete and perfect in its self-giving. How weak is the lure which this offers to our selfish instincts! There is in the Gospel a warning that the way of self-will leads to destruction, so that prudence itself counsels avoidance of it. But when we turn to seek another way there is none that commends itself to prudence only. For the reward that is offered is one that a selfish man would not enjoy. Heaven, which is fellowship with God, is only joy for those to whom love is the supreme treasure. Indeed, objectively regarded, Heaven and Hell may well be identical. Each is the realization that Man is utterly subject to the purpose of Another—of God who is Love. To the godly and unselfish soul that is joy unspeakable; to the selfish soul it is a misery against which he rebels in vain. Heaven and Hell are the two extreme terms of our possible reactions to the Gospel of the Love of God. "This is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light" (*John* 3^{19}). "This is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ" (*John* 17^{3}).

If with such thoughts to guide us, and paying regard to what seems the best help that contemporary thought can give us, we try in any way to schematize our beliefs in the future life, I suggest that the result is somewhat as follows.

God has created us as children of His love, able to understand that love in some degree and to respond to it. In the psycho-physical organism of human personality there is the possibility for a development of the spiritual elements, in response to and communion with the eternal God, which makes these capable of receiving from God the gift of His own immortality. Unless there has been such degeneration that only animal life continues to exist, it must be presumed that this possibility remains; and as it is hardly conceivable that any human being descends altogether to the level of the animal during this mortal life, it is further to be presumed that every personality survives bodily death. But that is not the same as to attain to immortality. And here we are confronted with a dilemma,

which I expect will remain insoluble so long as we have available only those data which are afforded by experience on this side of death. On the one hand is the supreme significance of human freedom, which seems to involve the possibility for every soul that it may utterly and finally reject the love of God; and this must involve it in perdition. God must assuredly abolish sin; and if the sinner so sinks himself in his sin as to become truly identified with it, God must destroy him also. On the other hand this result is failure on the part of God; for though He asserts His supremacy by destruction of the wicked, yet such victory is in fact defeat. For He has no pleasure in the death of him that dieth. The love which expressed itself in our creation can find no satisfaction in our annihilation, and we are prompted by faith in God's almighty love to believe, not in the total destruction of the wicked, but rather in some

> sad obscure sequestered state
> Where God unmakes but to re-make the soul
> He else first made in vain; which must not be.

As I have said, I do not think the dilemma can be resolved by us here on earth. At one time I confess that I was almost confident in accepting Universalism. Later I began to waver, and was much interested, when I told von Hügel that I was moving away from Universalism, to receive his reply that he found himself moving towards it. But while I am now by no means confident, I will offer what slender hope of a solution to the difficulty I am able to entertain.

There is one condition on which our conduct can be both free and externally determined. It is found wherever a man acts in a certain way in order to give pleasure to one whom he loves. Such acts are free in the fullest degree; yet their content is wholly determined by the pleasure of the person loved. Above all do we feel free when our love goes out in answer to love shown to us. Now the Grace of God is His love made known and active upon and within us; and our response to it is both entirely free and entirely due to the activity of His love towards us. All that we could contribute of our own would be the resistance of our self-will. It is just this which love breaks down, and in so doing does not over-ride our freedom but rather calls it into exercise. There is, therefore, no necessary contradiction in principle between asserting the full measure of human freedom and believing that in the end the Grace of God will win its way with every human heart.

But this must be interpreted in the light of the doctrine of "abiding consequences". If I allow myself to become set in self-centredness the love of God can only reach me through pain; and when it has found me and stirred my penitence and won me to forgiveness, I am still the forgiven sinner, not the always loyal child of God. And this general truth has application to every act of moral choice.

Again, because God is Love, the universe is so ordered that self-seeking issues in calamity. Thus we are warned that even when judged from its own standpoint self-seeking is unprofitable. But while mercy in this way gives to selfishness the only warning it is capable of heeding, there is no way offered of avoiding the calamity while the selfishness remains. The fear of future pain or of destruction may stimulate a man for his own self's sake to seek salvation; but the only salvation that exists or can exist is one that he can never find while he seeks it for his own self's sake. The warning is a warning that while he remains the sort of man he is, there is no hope for him; it is a call, not merely to a grudging change of conduct for fear of worse or hope of better; it is a call to a change of heart which can only exist so far as it is not grudging but willing. Thus it is a call for surrender to that Grace of God which alone can effect such a change of heart. It is Love that keeps aflame the hell of fire to warn us that in selfishness there is no satisfaction even for self; and Love then calls the soul which heeds that warning to submit itself to the moulding influences of Love by which it may be transformed; and the promise is of a joy which only those who are transformed into the likeness of Love can know, while to others it is the very misery from which they seek deliverance.

In such a view there is neither the demoralizing influence of a cheery optimism which says, "Never mind; it will all come right in the end", nor the equally demoralizing influence of a terrorism which stereotypes self-centredness by undue excitation of fear. There is an appeal to self-concern in those who can heed no other, but it is an appeal to leave all self-concern behind. Again there is no promise for the future which can encourage any soul to become forgetful of God, for the promise is of fellowship with God, and therein, but only therein, of fellowship also with those whom we have loved. It is an austere doctrine, more full of the exigency than of the consolations of religion, though it offers these also in gracious abundance to all who submit to its demands, for to be drawn into fellowship with God is to find that the Communion of Saints is a reality. And the core of the doctrine is this: Man is not immortal by nature or of right; but there is offered to him resurrection from the dead and life eternal if he will receive it from God and on God's terms. There is nothing arbitrary in that offer or in those terms, for God is perfect Wisdom and perfect Love. But Man, the creature and helpless sinner, cannot attain to eternal life unless he gives himself to God, the Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier, and receive from Him both worthiness for life eternal and with that worthiness eternal life.

William Ebor

NATIONALISM AS A RELIGION.

Nationalism is a spirit which seems to be dominating the world and blinding men's eyes increasingly every day. It has infected every department of our lives, so that we may suffer from economic nationalism, political nationalism, literary nationalism, or religous nationalism, or from all of these combined and other forms of the disease as well. Indeed, as is apt to be the case with contagious diseases, the more it spreads the more it lays hold of those who have no desire to be its victims, but who are compelled to succumb to it because it has become so widespread that escape from it is impossible. That is, I suppose, the excuse that some of us have to offer for the fact that our Free Trade country is, apparently, under the necessity of adopting methods of Protection. With us in this country, however, economic nationalism has not yet attained the rank of a religion, unless that is so in the case of those who hold it in the spirit of Lord Beaverbrook, whom the *Manchester Guardian* recently described as "a Pedlar of Dreams". He seems to be rapt from earth by the vision of a heaven where we shall one day live together in an idyllic condition "uncontaminated by Dane or Dutchman or any other foreign devil".

When our theories take possession of us with such a faith as that, they are taking the place of religion in our lives and govern us with a religious power. In lands like India and China to-day there are multitudes in whom nationalism has become a devout passion which controls their economic theories, their political ambitions, and their religious profession. In fact, whatever the religion may be that they profess—and it is likely to be a "national' religion—their real religion is patriotism. A man's religion has been defined by a western philosopher as "that consciousness in which he takes up a certain attitude to the world and gathers to a focus the meaning of his life." That is precisely what the national consciousness has become to many in these countries. Nationalism has become the central principle in their lives by which life's values are estimated, that which gives life its meaning and purpose and strengthens them to make sacrifices for it. In fact, it takes for them the place of religion.

Someone a year or two ago asked a Chinese student, "What is the most living religious question in China to-day?" The reply that was immediately given was, "The question of extra-territoriality". Such a cause as that in China, or *swaraj* in India, awakens fanatical emotion and makes men and women in these lands willing to sacrifice everything for it. This religious ardour may be more intense and have a more ideal content in their case than in the case of the European in East Africa who sees his comfort and prosperity threatened by the claims of the black man and the brown, but when he appeals to

the privileges of "the white man's religion" he is describing just another nationalism and one that on his lips is far less worthy than those of the Chinese and Indian patriots. An Indian Christian in a moment of exasperation declared not long ago—and with some justification—"There are three great religions in India—Hinduism, Mohammedanism, and Europeanism". But what we find in the case of the nationalism of the Indian and the Chinese is a religion which may have an evil enough influence on those who profess it but which at least delivers them from self-seeking.

If we are to understand what this religion means and form a true judgment in regard to it we must realize the good elements that are in it as well as the evil ones. If it awakens men and women from mental lethargy and moral inertia then it has so far advanced them to be wise. It is certainly true of the Hinduism that so many inherit in India that it is an opiate, drugging their energies, teaching them that life is unreal and that there are no spiritual values that are abiding or that are worth striving for. Their own best leaders are aware—apart altogether from political ambitions—that, if India is to have any future, her children must recover energy and purpose, must get more iron into their blood. And this that they have been seeking through a revivified Hinduism has been suddenly achieved from another quarter altogether. The new wind of nationalism has swept down upon them, filling their sails, and threatening to become a tempest. It has come "shaking the torpor from their creed", making them—to continue the quotation from Browning—"prepared to die, that is, alive at last".

This is a change that—so far forth—is something to rejoice in. It may mean an awakening to a narrow life, but it is a life not only more vigorous but wider in its reach than the old one. To live for the nation is a higher thing than to live for the family, as was the old way in China and in great measure in India also. Even when internationalism was much talked of by the leaders of the theistic *Samajes* it was an ideal that was enveloped in unreality. There was much talk of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, but it was mostly vapouring, and an outcaste was seldom seen in their places of worship. The new nationalism has brought the crime of untouchability into the glare of noonday. "Their shame and ours", says Mr. Gandhi. As a sin against national unity and national self-respect it has been brought home to their bosoms at last by means of this new religion that not only is professed but moves and governs their emotions and their acts.

If nationalism accomplishes this end for the Hindu population, it will do much to justify the religious fervour which it has aroused. "The dream of Indian nationalism", one of the South Indian leaders says, "will be realized fully with the passing away of caste from our

land". This particular leader is referring specially to a movement which was organized for the vindication of self-respect, and that is a second consequence from nationalism that we much rejoice in. It sets men up upon their feet, giving them a common cause of which they can be justly proud. It helps to deliver them from what Dr. Rabindranath Tagore calls "the Sudra spirit", that is, the spirit that cringes. A gathering of non-Brahmans recently went so far as to express in a resolution their want of confidence in Mr. Gandhi because of "his undermining of the sense of confidence and self-reliance in the people by his deliberate invocations of God in all his acts and utterances". They want, it is evident, a religion that will give them back their manhood and that, they think, the religion of nationalism will do.

These are some good things that may be counted as fruits of this spirit. But there are evils that more than balance the account. Like so many other things that we call good these that have been named are good in respect of what they affirm but evil in respect of what they deny or oppose. The Self Respect League of Madras, for example, inculcates its excellent doctrine by teaching its non-Brahman members to call the Brahman "a cow-eating butcher"—and more scurrilous abuse can scarcely be imagined in the language of the Hindu. The more ardently the Hindu patriot worships "Mother India", the more he execrates the foreigner who does not join with him wholeheartedly in this worship. That is too often the spirit that nationalism creates.

And, further, there is a narrowness in this religion that inevitably blinds the devotee to other good things. If one can say truly, "So that I may help my countrymen and share their humble lives I am willing to do without foreign comforts and exotic luxuries, and, denying myself, to live a narrow life alone with them and be content",—then that is worthy and praiseworthy. That is what is good in Mahatma Gandhi's "religion of *swadeshi*". *"Swadeshi"*, he says, "is that spirit within us which restricts us to the use and service of our immediate surroundings to the exclusion of the remote". Applied to material things this is a rule of self-sacrifice to which we must give the highest praise. The simplicity of Mr. Gandhi's own life, brought down as near as may be to the level of the Indian peasant, is an evidence of his deep sympathy with the poor and his desire to bear their burdens. But this rule cannot apply to spiritual gifts which are free for everyone to take and lacking which our souls are impoverished. Applying his *swadeshi* rule Mr. Gandhi says, "In the matter of religion I must restrict myself to my ancestral religion". Here we see how nationalism may become a means by which the soul is narrowed and stunted. No one has a right to deny himself virtue or truth. If even Mr. Gandhi yields to this jealous impulse as though

religious truth, or indeed any truth, was confined within national boundaries and was one thing to one nation and another thing to another, then how much more is it likely to be the case that a nationalism that is held passionately by the ordinary man will make him blind and deaf to what is true and good for every man?

A simple example will show how this spirit operates. A foreigner was walking on a very hot day in north India with an Indian friend who was protected from the sun only by an Indian cap or puggaree. The foreigner turned to him and said, "It is dangerous for you to be so exposed to the sun. Why do you not wear a sun topee?" The Indian replied, "As soon as we get *swaraj* the first thing I shall do will be to buy a sun topee". Nationalist pride made it impossible for him, so long as his country was not free from foreign rule, to wear a foreign head-dress even though he knew it to be better than his own. It might be well that he should so deny himself in a matter such as that, even at the cost of health, but no one can maintain with seriousness that in the region of the true and of the good national barriers should divide men. Mr. Gandhi can only hold to his religious *swadeshism* because he is really in religion a devout agnostic who believes that we are all groping in the dark. He does not really believe that "east of Suez" "there ain't no ten commandments". But nationalism, as we see constantly in India at the present time, tends to make men uphold what they know to be wrong just because it is part of their national tradition. Thus national feeling and the sense of a common brotherhood in the nation's life is proving, as we have seen, a powerful motive to overthrow caste; but at the same time, if caste is attacked from without by a foreigner, the instinct of nationalism is up in arms at once to defend the evil thing.

But the most serious count of all against nationalism, when it attains in men's eyes the dimensions of a religion, is that it is a non-moral power. It is amazing how much strength it reveals in those of whom it takes possession. We may have despised them before as timid, flaccid, apathetic creatures, possessing no virility. But let this passion awake in them and we see them throwing away their lives in reckless defiance, or dying inch by inch by hunger-strike rather than yield to those they hate. But we see this new strength at the service of a wholly unmoral deity. Neither Mother India nor Britannia nor any other national deity scrutinizes the moral quality of the offerings upon her altar. Assassination is consecrated in the service of these deities and the assassin Bhagat Sing becomes a holy martyr in the cause of India.

The whole of the national struggle in India throughout the past years has been perverting the moral instincts of the Indian people, Christian, Hindu, Muslim, making wrong seem right to them and falsehood truth. That is always what happens in such a struggle

which engages men's passions and fills their hearts with hate. It was so in Ireland, and it will be many a year before Ireland ceases to pay the bitter price. It is so in India, and the work of the Christian Church there is being frustrated and submerged beneath a tide of evil. Young men and women, who are seeking, as youth should, for a cause that shall fill their hearts, are finding in this the cause that they seek, and are doing battle with their fellows instead of doing battle with iniquity. They are saying, in the words of one of them, "We must learn to kill and to kill scientifically". "Rebellion is my religion", says that fine, eager, young Indian, Jawaharlal Nehru.

There was an able Madrasi student who a few years ago was sent to gaol for sedition. He had tried to satisfy his young heart, hungry for sacrifice, by giving himself up wholly to his country's cause. To him in his prison cell, as to the blinded Saul in his room in Damascus, came the discovery of a cause worthy of all that he had to surrender, and he became a Christian. In Bengal about the same time another young heart felt the same passion burning, and it swept him into a course of crime. He narrowly escaped punishment, and later he too found in Christ what he had been seeking by such dangerous and evil ways. These two men are typical of hundreds in whom a desire has awakened that can only be rightly satisfied in the service of the Son of Man. Not only are innumerable eager and passionate hearts being offered up on these altars of hate that are more cruel than those of Kali, but Christians also are turning away from the gospel of love to learn instead this bitter gospel. In an atmosphere such as that of India it does not suffice to say that patriotism is not enough; it turns the hearts of the young to ashes and takes the sun out of their sky. Let us beware lest it has to be said of us, "Woe unto the people by whom this offence cometh".

Nicol Macnicol.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN SCHOLARSHIP[1].

I AM deeply conscious of the importance of the subject I have to handle in this meeting. What we think of Jesus Christ is of the very essence of Christianity. I will not say that it is itself the essence. That is our relation to God—God is the foundation of Christianity, as of all religion. But it is Jesus Christ Who brings us into communion with God; and what we actually have in Him is all bound up most intimately with what we find in Jesus. Our thought of God, our hope in God, our faith in God, our comfort and joy in God, will depend upon the way in which we come to Him through Jesus.

What difference has modern scholarship made in what we may find in Jesus, and so in what we may find in God through Him? It is a very important question.

For the sake of clearness I shall divide the subject into four parts:

I. A general statement of the problem.

II. The quest of scholarship for the historical Jesus.

III. The necessity of finding Christ's Divinity within His humanity.

IV. How far a re-statement of Christology is possible.

I. *General Statement of the problem.*

We cannot simply ignore scholarship, and assume that it is irrelevant to our Christian certainties.

It will not serve to stand with the Fundamentalist on the authority of the Bible, or with the Catholic on the authority of the Church, in order to discount as valueless, or at least unimportant, whatever modern scholarship may have to say with reference to the Person of Christ. That is to take up a dogmatic attitude towards our subject. It is to assume that the question before us is settled already, and to assert that we know so well what is to be said on the Person of Christ that no one can teach us anything. All that can be said about the dogmatic attitude is that in the end it rests on a decision to exclude certain matters, be they what they may, from free investigation.

Such a decision is arbitrary, and altogether irrational. It is also useless. It is like a barrier of sand erected against a flowing tide, which may stand for a while, but which at last must give way and let in the flood.

For, what is modern scholarship? It is simply the principle of free critical investigation. It is anti-dogmatic, not in the sense that

[1] An essay read at the Theological Conference of the Centenary meetings of the Congregational Union in Manchester, 7th October, 1931.

it is necessarily opposed to the content of any dogma, but because it will not agree to allow anything to be reserved from critical inquiry. Our most cherished beliefs become matter for free investigation and discussion—there is nothing that can be kept back.

For centuries Biblical and theological scholarship was dogmatic. During the earlier centuries of the Christian Church great decisions were arrived at as to the essential contents of the Christian Faith; and they were embodied in the œcumenical Creeds. Central in the discussions which led to those Creeds was the question of the Person of Christ, then as always of vital concern to the Church.

What is the dogma of the Person of Christ which was fixed in the Creeds?

It is that Jesus Christ is the Eternal Word of God, the Second Person of the Trinity, Who became incarnate by the assumption of a human nature in addition to the Divine nature which He possessed already. As the Incarnate Word, He is one Person, in two natures, with both a Divine will and a human will, which work in concord.

The dogma requires the impersonality of Christ's human nature: the personality of the Incarnate Word is that of the Eternal Word who became incarnate.

For centuries scholarship, when dealing with the Person of Christ, was dogmatic in the sense that all Biblical and theological discussion was controlled by the Christology of the Creeds. That was the case both among Catholics and Protestants. At the Reformation the Creeds were carried over from Catholicism into Protestantism intact: it was only the subsequently added doctrines of medieval scholasticism that were modified.

But side by side with the Reformation was the Renaissance, which renewed in Christendom the spirit of free inquiry that in the ancient world was characteristic of the Greeks. In the eighteenth century this spirit of free inquiry began to spread within the Protestant Churches. In the nineteenth century it developed and grew strong. In the twentieth century its results have accumulated, and are now before us in that great mass of learning which we speak of as modern scholarship. What is the result of all this work, as far as concerns our conception of the Person of Christ?

II. *The quest of the historical Jesus.*

Modern scholarship has opposed the Jesus of History to the Christ of Faith. Dogmatic scholarship knew of no such distinction. Every story and every word of Jesus in the Gospels was interpreted in accordance with the principles of the Creeds. Free inquiry, however, exhibits to us features in the historical picture of Jesus which are hard to harmonize with the Creeds. In the end, it has endeavoured to form a conception of Jesus on its own, unaided and unhampered

by the Dogma. This is the conception we call the historical Jesus, or the Jesus of History. It is a legitimate and necessary conception.

Let us consider the stages by which scholarship has arrived at its results. They are four in number:

(1) The distinction between Gospels and Epistles;

(2) The distinction between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic Gospels;

(3) The analysis of the Synoptic Gospels into their sources;

(4) The method of Form-History.

After describing these stages we will review

(5) The result of criticism as a whole.

(1) *Gospels and Epistles.*

The first stage, which goes back as far as the English Deists, was the separation between the Gospels and the Epistles. We do not now interpret the Gospels in terms of the theology of St. Paul, or of that of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. On the contrary, we recognize in the Gospels the product of a movement in some ways opposed to Paulinism. For Paul the history of Jesus was comparatively unimportant. He was determined to know Christ, not after the flesh, but according to the Spirit. All that remained of the history for the Apostle was the great saving acts of the Incarnation, the Death, and the Resurrection. But the writers of the Gospels thought and felt otherwise. They were intensely interested in the story of Jesus as He lived and moved among men. Their way of preaching Christianity was not solely by doctrine, but also by a record of Christ's words and works, and by a long and detailed story of His Passion, ending with a briefer account of the Resurrection.

(2) *John and the Synoptics.*

The second stage in the work of modern scholarship has been to distinguish between the way in which we are to understand the Fourth Gospel, and that in which we take the three others, which we call the Synoptic Gospels. Put sharply and without the finer qualifications, the distinction is this: The Fourth Gospel is theology using history as a plastic medium for its great ideas; The Synoptic Gospels, even if their story is theologically coloured, fashion all their teaching under the compulsion of "irreducible and stubborn facts". The Christian Church in general has not become used to this distinction between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic Gospels. Thirty years ago English scholarship was in general very conservative about the *Gospel of John*, and was represented at its best by Westcott's beautiful commentary. Freer views of the Fourth Gospel were for the most part upheld by Continental scholars, and refuted by

English authors. Now the case is otherwise. The difference between the Fourth Gospel and the other Gospels is to-day one of the commonplaces of criticism. It does not matter that at points the historical details of the Fourth Gospel may be more accurate than those of the other Gospels, or that they also may show to some extent the influence of theological ideas. The fact remains that *John* is theology using a historical medium—the Synoptic Gospels for all their theological colouring contain a nucleus of irreducible fact.

(3) *The Sources.*

It is, then, to the Synoptic Gospels that we must go for the Jesus of History. The criticism that has separated them from the Fourth Gospel has also analysed them into their sources. The results are before us in such a work as Canon Streeter's *The Four Gospels,* which may be said to sum up the results of half a century or more of criticism. Most of us are familiar with the generally accepted notion that *Mark* itself is one of the sources of *Matthew* and *Luke.* The other common source is the collection principally containing teaching, which used to be called the *Logia,* but is now generally known as *Q. Luke* had a special source besides, containing matter of a similar quality with what we find in *Mark* and *Q.* Streeter thinks that *Matthew* had such a special source also—this is the most disputed point in his scheme.

At any rate, we have a considerable body of very primitive tradition concerning Jesus, which must emanate from Palestinian Christianity, and which forms a great counter-weight to the lack of history in the Pauline Epistles and the free use of history in the Fourth Gospel.

The Infancy stories and the genealogies in *Matthew* and *Luke* stand by themselves, and do not belong to the primitive nucleus.

(4) *Form-History.*

The question which is now forced upon us is this—What are the irreducible facts concerning the Person of Christ which the primitive nucleus contains? We cannot say that everything in *Mark,* or in *Q,* or in the similarly primitive material of Luke, is of the nature of irreducible and stubborn fact. Christian theology did not begin with St. Paul: it began with the Palestinian Church. It cannot be denied that *Mark* and *Q* and *Proto-Luke* are monuments of Christian faith rather than documents of simple history.

The most recent criticism of the Synoptic Gospels, which goes by the name of "Form-History", has been endeavouring to work out the process by which the earliest Palestinian Christians developed the elements of Gospel story which were afterwards composed into our *Mark, Matthew,* and *Luke.* The most important conceptions are those of single aphoristic sayings and of single short stories, whose meaning

is often clinched with a telling word. Such sayings reveal some aspect of the Kingdom of God which is the subject of the preaching of Jesus; while the stories present some aspect of Jesus as Saviour.

The older historical critics were inclined to see in *Mark* a generally reliable outline of the course of the ministry of Jesus and its issue in Jerusalem. These recent investigators tell us that we cannot write a consecutive life of Jesus from the Synoptic Gospels any more than we can from the Fourth Gospel. They appear to have a good deal of right on their side, though a complete scepticism as to the Marcan order of events is unwarranted. Even if *Mark* was put together largely from separate fragmentary stories and sayings, it does not follow that it was without all recollection as to where they fitted.

(5) *The net result.*

What then, finally, are the irreducible facts which are left to us in the Synoptic Gospels, when we have duly weighed what the Form-historians have to say? Bultmann, probably the most outstanding representative of the new school, sums up these facts under two heads and names a third point which he considers more uncertain[1]. The first two heads are the ethic and the eschatological expectation of Jesus—the third point is His Messianic claim. I cannot doubt myself but that all three represent "irreducible and stubborn facts" in the life of Jesus. We will take (*a*) the ethic and the eschatology together, and then (*b*) the Messianic claim.

(*a*) *Ethic and Eschatology.* In both His ethic and His eschatology Jesus appears as a prophet, speaking for God and from God. He is concerned solely to set men in relation with God, so as to compel a decision for or against Him.

The ethic of Jesus is essentially *religious*. It exhibits God as at once the Father and the Judge of men, who are called to the life of sonship in which they love God and their neighbour as themselves. Of this life of sonship Jesus is the great Example.

The eschatology of Jesus is a doctrine of the speedy end of the world and the establishment of a Divine Kingdom in a new age, in which the pains, the sorrows, and the sins of the present age are done away.

The common element in both the ethic and the eschatology is the way in which Jesus casts men entirely upon God. The ethical demand of Jesus for a complete obedience to God centres our life in that personal relation to Him in which, after all that we have done, we can only say that we are unprofitable servants and have to seek the Divine forgiveness.

The eschatological view of Jesus shows the world as lying entirely

[1] See his tractate, *Die Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien* (1930), pp. 38-40.

in God's hands, so that salvation from all woes is to be expected solely from Him. In both ways, Jesus brings us face to face with the Divine grace, and this is His great saving and redeeming work.

Why are the ethic and the eschatology of Jesus alike irreducible facts in the tradition concerning them?

The ethic is an irreducible fact because of its *originality* and *uniqueness*. It may be said that much of it can be paralleled from other sources, the *Old Testament*, the *Talmud*, Greek philosophy, or non-Christian religions. That may be true; nevertheless as a whole it bears a stamp of originality and individuality quite unmistakable. No one can mistake the Christian ethic for any other. It has been the most persistent element in the history of Christianity. Even Paul, who has so little of the story of Jesus in Palestine, tenaciously conserves the ethic of Jesus. The ethic of Paul is substantially the ethic of Jesus Himself.

The eschatology is an irreducible fact, not merely because it is absolutely interwoven with the tradition, but also because the notion of the speedy end of the world quite soon became so great a difficulty to the Christian Church, that nothing could have kept the eschatological prophecy of Jesus so firmly in place in the Gospels, but the actual historical recollection that thus and thus He had said.

(*b*) *The Messiahship*. A third stubborn fact in the tradition concerning Jesus is undoubtedly His Messianic claim. Bultmann indeed hesitates on this point; or at any rate he says that if Jesus claimed to be the Messiah it was in a sense altogether novel in which it is not essentially different from His Prophethood.

It may be readily admitted that Jesus held a very different view of the Messianic office from that current among the Jews. But scepticism about the Messianic claim of Jesus is unwarranted. The external aspect of His life turns entirely upon the question of His Messiahship. The Messianic claim is the only reasonable explanation of His execution. *Mark's* account of a revelation of the Messiahship to the disciples and of a Messianic advance upon Jerusalem rings true. It explains the despair of the disciples when Jesus was crucified, and shows why the Resurrection appearances and the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost were valued originally as proof that Jesus was the Messiah.

To sum up. The ethic and the eschatology and the Messianic claim of Jesus are the stubborn facts of the primitive Palestinian tradition. That does not mean, of course, that nothing else in the tradition is valid. Stubborn facts are to a tradition *what an anchor is to a ship*. They serve to hold it in place. The undeniable facts of the life of Jesus give general support to the whole story, so far as it is consonant with them. It is for criticism to test individual details one by one: that is a matter beyond the scope of this essay.

III. *The Necessity of finding Christ's Divinity within His humanity.*

We have to apply the results of modern scholarship to a consideration of the doctrine of the Person of Christ.

One thing emerges at once. It is that the Christology of the Creeds, as it stands, is not consistent with what we know of the Jesus of History. I do not think that that need trouble Congregationalists, who have continually urged their independence of a creed. We need not feel secretly bound to the Creeds, whose authority we do not openly acknowledge.

The point at which the history of Jesus comes into conflict with the Creeds is as regards His humanity. The Jesus of History, whatever else He was, was a man. He was a prophet; and he spoke as a prophet from deep personal impression and conviction without regard to the logical consistency of His different utterances.

He did not attempt to reconcile His ethical teaching, which has reference to the present order of the world, with His eschatological expectation, in which the present world counted for nothing.

In the ethic, moreover, Jesus taught that man must become a son of God, Who is our Father; yet He also used the language of merit and reward, and thought of God as a Lawgiver and Judge.

He depicted God as a Father, loving and forgiving beyond all earthly ideas of fatherhood; yet He also spoke of the rejection from the Kingdom into outer darkness of all who rebelled against His message.

Facts like these are readily explicable, if we think of Jesus as a man, and as a prophet speaking according to the impressions and convictions of the moment, without any thought of reducing His teaching to a logical system. But they do not fit in well with the doctrine of the Creeds, according to which the personality of Jesus is that of the Eternal Word of God, Who has assumed an impersonal human nature.

The correct logical consequence of the doctrine of the Creeds is that Jesus was omniscient as well as omnipotent. Under such circumstances a prophetic consciousness, such as has been described, is impossible in His case. Everything that He said must be true without limitation or reserve, not merely as spoken in His own time, but for all ages of the world.

This, to be sure, is precisely the Fundamentalist notion of Jesus, which opposes His quotations from Moses and David to the criticism of the *Old Testament,* and which is bound to put some artificial explanation upon His unfulfilled prophecies of the speedy advent of the Kingdom.

To abandon the Christology of the Creeds is not necessarily to abandon the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ. We may acknowledge to the full that Jesus was a man and that He spoke

prophetically as did other prophets, according to immediate inspiration and conviction, without regard to logical system.

But that need not prevent our recognizing in Him the perfect and complete Revelation of God within humanity. It is rather the condition of recognizing such a Revelation. Jesus must be most Divine just when He is most human; not Divine as though that involved some abridgment of His humanity, but Divine in the peculiar *quality* and *content* of His humanity, which distinguishes it from the humanity of the rest of us sinful men.

Let me conclude this part of my subject by referring to certain objections to finding Divinity in the humanity of Jesus.

The first type of objections consists of those based on the prophetic character of the knowledge of Jesus. To exhibit logical inconsistencies in the teaching of Jesus is no proof that He was not Divine. It is only to say that He was neither a mathematician nor a philosopher, nor even a theologian. The mathematician attains complete logical coherence by attending simply to abstractions. The philosopher endeavours to bring coherence into common knowledge. The common knowledge of all of us, which takes the form of impressions based on convictions, is never logically consistent. The philosopher tries to reduce it to coherence; but no philosopher has ever yet succeeded completely. A perfectly consistent system of knowledge remains an ideal which in the nature of things cannot be fully realized. What is true of common knowledge is true also of religious knowledge. If it is human it takes the form of convictions based upon impressions. In proportion as it is vital and urgent it tends to take the shape of propositions logically incompatible, the balance between which is worked out in the stress of life by successive decisions, fresh with each moment.

The theologian tries to bring all religious judgments into a system, and his work is useful; but, in the very nature of things, he can never attain a perfect system any more than the philosopher can do in his wider sphere. It cannot be otherwise—

> Life like a dome of many coloured glass
> Stains the white radiance of eternity,
> Until death tramples it to fragments.

Just because He was a man, Jesus gave us religious truth in the shifting and changing colours of earth. There was no other way for a Divine Revelation within humanity.

A second class of objections to the Divinity of Jesus is of those based on the fact that His character was genuinely human.

The character of Jesus is an important support to His ethic. We know that teaching is the lesser part of revelation. The power that commends the teaching is the character of the teacher. If it be granted that the human form of the teaching of Jesus is no ground

on which to dispute His Divinity, there is still the question of His character. Did He come short of His own teaching? Are there faults in His recorded example that compel us after all to say that He was a good man and the best of men, but not Divine, not uniquely different from others, or morally perfect? I think it is a mistake to fix attention on small details of manner or expression, such as an apparently harsh word spoken to the Syrophœnicean woman, or to His mother—it is equally beside the mark to complain of His severity in dealing with the Scribes and Pharisees. It may be true that in the above cases the Evangelists have transformed or developed the words of Jesus into something different from His intention; but let us take the record as it stands, and I see nothing to blame. The Gospels are not sufficiently full to enable us always to see the motive behind particular words of Jesus; but what impresses one is the general goodwill which manifests itself in them all. Supposing, for example, that there is a more favourable view that can be taken of the Pharisees, that is no reason why a prophet should not castigate the faults He saw in them.

It is the same with the ethical behaviour of Jesus as it is with His teaching. He moves upon impressions and convictions, not upon some abstract code that is not human enough to allow of a sharp word or a biting sarcasm on occasion. "Generation of vipers" is a prophet's forcible name for misleading and injurious teachers.

That the faith of Jesus was not always unclouded exhibits His humanity, but is surely no moral stain upon His will, which held on to God even in spite of the cloud. That Jesus refused to be called good, and bade an inquirer reserve the word for God alone, proves His humility, and so His essential goodness.

In general, the goodness of Jesus is not to be looked for in the absence of everything in His conduct which may cause hesitation on our part as to its meaning or reason. It lies in the positive victorious love which manifests itself so plainly in the whole tenor of His life. The character of Jesus needs no defence, but if it is to be defended the right defence is along the lines of Emerson's notion of essential goodness:

> There will be an agreement in whatever variety of actions, so long as they be each honest and natural in their hour. For, of one will, the actions will be harmonious, however unlike they seem. These varieties are lost sight of at a little distance, at a little height of thought. One tendency unites them all. The voyage of the best ship is a zig-zag line of a hundred tacks. See the line from a sufficient distance, and it straightens itself to the average tendency. Your genuine action will explain itself and will explain your other genuine actions. Your conformity explains nothing. Act singly, and what you have done singly will justify you now. The force of character is cumulative.

That is what Emerson says of human goodness. The goodness of Jesus was human goodness; but because His will to good was unchanging, we recognize His human goodness as Divine.

IV. *How far re-statement is possible.*

We come back to the question of the Christology of the Creeds. The Creeds deserve our respect and gratitude for the way in which they have conserved the Christian doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus throughout the ages. If, as they stand, they have become impossible to us, is it feasible to re-state the doctrine in a modern way? If we admit a genuinely human personality in Jesus, how are we to state the doctrine of His Divinity?

I will conclude this essay (*a*) by attempting to modernize the primitive Christian confession of the Messiahship of Jesus, and (*b*) by considering very briefly the implications of such a statement as regards the doctrine of the Trinity.

(*a*) *Modernization of the Messiahship of Jesus.*

What is necessary is to make a bridge in thought between the Jesus of History and the Christ of Faith. On the one hand, we must so think of the historical Jesus as to explain how He became the object of the Church's faith. On the other hand, we must see that our faith is not cut off from its roots in history. The paradox, but also the glory, of Christianity is this: "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us". To put the same thing in modern terms: The history has a permanent and abiding value; the Revelation is a matter of irreducible and stubborn fact.

It seems to me that we shall best meet our modern situation by taking a firm hold upon the earliest and most original confession of the Christian Church: *Jesus is the Messiah.* That confession, to my mind, is the firm bridge between the Jesus of History and the Christ of Faith. I can entertain no doubt whatever that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah; while the confession of Him as the Messiah was the prime and original Christology from which all later Christologies have been developed.

The Messiahship of Jesus means that He is the earthly representative of God and God's plenipotentiary in His Kingdom. The meaning of the Messiahship is developed in the two great complementary titles, *Son of God* and *Son of Man.* The first name ascribes to Jesus a unique and perfect filial consciousness. The second describes Him as the Ideal Man, Who is the Divinely appointed Head of humanity.

The title *Messiah,* though a traditional name of glory for Jesus, is not immediately applicable for a modern Christology. What we need to do is to translate it into its present-day equivalent. It stands for the saving advent of God in history, which is the common theme

of every *New Testament* writer, no matter what are the categories in which he sets it forth.

To modernize the title *Messiah*, we shall say that Jesus is the Perfect and Ideal Man Who all throughout His life yielded Himself absolutely in obedience to God in such a way that His whole thought and feeling were one with the Spirit of God, and that He became the human organ of God's saving manifestation in the world. As such a human representative of God He is eternally one with God and now dwells among us through the Spirit of God, which is His Spirit also.

Jesus does not hide God from us, or come between us and God. We see God in Him. We know God as Our Father, because His Fatherhood is reflected in the Sonship of Jesus, the Christ.

(b) *Implications as regards the doctrine of the Trinity.*

The doctrine of the Trinity is a speculative attempt to understand that fullness of the life of God which is the metaphysical background of His saving manifestation in Jesus and in the Spirit. Such a speculative doctrine is a natural and inevitable result of faith in the Divinity of Jesus Christ. But it is wrong to take the Athanasian or any other creed in a dogmatic way as a starting-point for the interpretation of Jesus. It is a mistake even to take individual expressions and statements in the Pauline and Johannine thought in a dogmatic way, as though, just as they stand, they settled exactly the way in which we must think of Jesus. What we have to envisage is the use of category upon category borrowed from different stages of religious and philosophical thought, in the endeavour to elucidate the significance of Jesus.

It is not my business to attempt a complete doctrine of the Trinity at the close of this essay[1]. I will only say now that it seems to me that a Christology which without hesitation assigns to Jesus a real human personality connects itself naturally with that interpretation of Trinitarianism, due to St. Augustine, which lays stress on the Unity of God rather than on the distinction of the Persons. The Persons in the Trinity certainly stand for real and substantial differences in the Divine Being, which guarantee us against thinking of God as a mere abstract Unity. But it is surely impossible to think of the Persons after the analogy of three individual human personalities. The defence of such a conception of the Trinity by a "social" doctrine of the Godhead seems to me to verge dangerously near to Tritheism.

Let us tentatively define the Word of God as that substantial mode of God's Being in which He is revealed to us, and the Spirit

1 Some suggestions as to what I think possible may be found in my essay, " The Fullness of God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit ", read at the Cambridge Conference of Congregationalists in 1929, (*Congregational Quarterly*, VII. 549-556).

of God as that equally substantial mode of His Being by which He dwells in us, both modes of the Divine Being being as Eternal as God is, and Personal as they share in the Divine Personality.

If, then, the human personality of Jesus was indwelt Personally by God so completely that God's Personal Revelation became one with Christ's humanity, we can say that the Incarnation consists of the unification of the Eternal Word with Jesus through the Eternal Spirit. That is the Divine side of what has previously been expressed from the side of Christ's human personality.

I believe that such a doctrine of the Trinity and of the Incarnation can be adequately grounded in Christian experience. That, after all, is the fundamental test for all our forms of doctrine.

There is a Greek story of Antæus, the giant who renewed his strength every time he touched his mother earth. That is the way with Christian thought in relation to Christian experience. After all the changes that modern scholarship has brought upon us, it still remains true that we find God in Jesus as we do nowhere else. Our Christology is only the imperfect expression of this experience in the terms possible to our age and time. Driven from one form of Christology, we do but take up another, and say, if not in the language of the fourth and fifth centuries, yet in that of the twentieth, that Jesus is Divine because we find God uniquely in Him.

Robert S. Franks.

DISCUSSION[1].

In dealing with so tremendous a theme, I have resolved—although with great reluctance—to write and read my attempted contribution, rather than literally "open discussion". Ten minutes were allotted to me, at my own suggestion. But I now find that it is impossible to do anything worthy within such narrow limits; and I must appeal to the intelligence and goodwill of the audience to make something out of my extremely elliptical remarks. If I should appear to be too dogmatic, let it be understood that I am propounding "theses" for debate.

Dr. Franks—who kindly sent me some days ago a brief outline of his paper—has kept pretty closely to the particular topic indicated by the title. Biblical scholarship, in somewhat full detail, is his line of approach. I desire to begin by dwelling upon other much more obvious, but by no means unimportant, results of the same scholarship.

The Epistles then—the very Epistles—do not, I venture to say, contain either the Athanasian Trinity or the Chalcedonian Christology. Both of these are obscure speculative constructions, precariously supported upon slender Biblical data. Article VIII of the 39 Articles is mistaken when it affirms that "The Three Creeds . . . may be proved by most certain warrants of holy scripture". And, in an age when we are being squeezed to yield everything for the sake of what is called "*Re*union", we have to be on our guard. Scriptural or unscriptural, true or untrue, believed or merely

[1] This address opened the discussion on Dr. Franks's paper.

recited, the Creeds will be vehemently *urged* upon us, on the ground that Episcopalian Christians cannot possibly be happy without them. Our godly ancestors of 1833, though with less respect for non-biblical formularies, thought much as the Anglican reformers had done regarding the coincidence of Church Christology with Bible teaching. We see more clearly to-day.

A distinguished living Presbyterian authority upon Christology, who stands for essential orthodoxy with certain subtle modifications, claims that an orthodox *credo* is involved in the very nature of Christian *experience,* if we will but think out the implications of our Christian life. In one passage, he comments upon the *naïveté* of some *N.T.* doctrines. But, as A. B. Davidson once said to us in class, "Modern systematic theology is dreadfully *tiresome* just because it knows *all about everything*". What is termed *naïveté* may indeed be a true token of divine inspiration. How does Article VI begin? "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation". I think we shall have to fall back on that sound Protestant principle, bridling the zeal of system-makers whether they follow old lines or new.

As to the Creed of Chalcedon in particular; this standard version of orthodox Christology seems to fall to pieces by its own weight, quite independently of the results of modern scholarship. Infinite faculties of mind and finite faculties, harmoniously co-operating while each takes its own way —such a scheme of things, in very deed, cannot be thought out. The finite, the Manhood, inevitably becomes *une quantité negligeable.* In addition, it is more than probable that careful study of the Life recorded for us in the Gospels confirms our distaste for Chalcedonian orthodoxy. At any rate, I agree at this important point with Dr. Franks. The Christology of Chalcedon will not do.

Nor do I dissent from the warning, contained in his summary if not in his paper, that we run grave risks if we identify the Christian cause with theories of Kenosis. Let it be enough if I name one argument. Although the *word* Kenosis comes from St. Paul, it is in the last degree improbable that the apostle—though he doubtless taught a Pre-existence Christology—had come face to face with the perplexities of modern orthodoxy regarding the transition of a Divine being from the fullness of heavenly knowledge to earthly limitations. In St. Paul, Kenosis probably just means "self-sacrifice".

Principal Franks adds the hint of a third Christology—one of "Immanence". Again, the wording is less that of the paper as read than of the summary sent me. I should like a little time to think over this suggestion. If Dr. Franks convinces us that the facts of our Lord's history on earth—when honestly considered—make the new view inevitable, then we are bound to say "Amen". On the other hand, if the Immanence Christology is to some extent a speculation, it takes its place in a long line —Chalcedonianism, Kenotic Christologies, Schleiermacher's theory of the Person of Christ, Ritschl's view. In any case, it wants to be fully expounded and carefully weighed.

So far I have mainly indicated my personal dissent from older positions. Before closing, I desire to feel my way, with such light as I possess, towards positive affirmations.

One feature is uniform in all the Christologies of the *N.T.*—within the Gospels, I am convinced, as much as within the Epistles—all of them call Jesus "Lord". That confession of faith, I believe, is the minimum Christology upon which the Christian Church ever can live; although to-day, alas, there are some who would refuse it to us. Perhaps the *maximum* Christological creed, which is suitable for educated modern Christian minds, will not differ much from this minimum.

Denials have gone still further. We have been told that Jesus must have been, and actually was, sinful. It is admitted, I suppose, that He was somewhat better than the best of *us;* but it is insisted that He was essentially "in all points . . . like as we are", and that it is a great mistake to wish Him other than this.

Such a view is hardly to be attributed to Biblical scholarship. It is due to a philosophical assumption—if I may not rather employ the word *prejudice.* At the very least, the assertion of the sinfulness of Jesus hangs in the air, until His faults are brought home to Him.

Even this last, however, is attempted.

For one thing, it is said that Jesus appears sometimes to have spoken without due respect to His mother. Now, as Bishop Butler would say, it is "a matter of great patience" to meet such a charge. The words complained of were spoken nearly 2,000 years ago; we have only fragmentary reports; but we know that they were spoken by the most godly and most loving among all the children of men. Yet some, who call themselves His disciples, to-day pull Him up, and—dismiss Him, perhaps, with a caution! "He that loveth father or mother more than me", says Jesus, "is not worthy of me". If His own mother tried to stand between Him and the call of God, do we dare to blame Him for putting God first?

A more serious accusation is formulated in view of *Matt.* 23 and kindred passages. There this loving Son of Man is reported as pronouncing dreadful condemnation upon religious *mis*leaders—those men who had done their best to make His task upon earth an impossibility.

Here we have arrived at an ultimate dividing line. It will not do, I submit, to ascribe these denunciations to unknown blundering disciples in the church of Jerusalem. We find a brief summary of the denunciations in our oldest Gospel, *Mark;* they occur again, varied at points but the same in essence, in *Luke;* we have them at their fullest, magnificent, tremendous, in the tradition as preserved in *Matthew.* If there is any meaning in historical evidence, this part of Christ's teaching is well attested.

Accordingly we infer that the ever-smiling Jesus of sentimental piety, in whatever quarters He may be proclaimed, is not the true Jesus of history, and is not the Christ of God. While matchless in love, Jesus burns like a flame of fire against those who are the resolute enemies of God and men. We read our Master's terrible words; and we tremble; but we adore. And our Christology still calls Jesus "Lord".

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

JOHN DONNE, 1572—1631.

DONNE belongs to that company of compelling writers that after several centuries still fascinates Englishmen. For years we may ignore them, when we read them they may repel, but they never disappear forgotten in the limbo of oblivion.

Bunyan is another of the company; they whet the appetite and supply mental food for all types of readers. They have a wit, a passion, a depth of thoughtfulness, an energy so eloquent that I have often wondered if these shining, varying facets of their genius are the heritage of our mixed race. Donne's poetry and prose—if we care to dissect them in this way—have a pungency, a broadness, and a depth of passion that is characteristically Teutonic; a richness of imagination that some call Celtic; a Latin wit, sometimes fierce, sometimes subtle, all blended into language that could not be translated adequately from its nervous English. But it is vain, if interesting, to analyse in this way, for what do we mean by the phrase " English to the core " but just this fusing of Latin, Celtic, and Teutonic qualities which is our great birthright?

To get full zest of pleasure from Donne he must be read fully. To read only the " profane " poems, or only the " divine " poems, or the poetry without the prose, is to maim Donne, and rob ourselves, for though some critics, lovers of periods and developments, divide our poet's career into two distinct halves—his early romantic one, and his later religious one—there is in reality no fundamental cleavage. If ever "the child was father to the man", or early and later days " bound each to each by natural piety ", it is so in Donne's case. It is misleading to separate the prayers and sermons of the Dean of St. Paul's from the brilliant satires and sensual poems of the young man who eloped with Anne More, and was imprisoned in the Fleet; to place in one category the " divine " poems as spiritual, the " profane " poems as sensual. Donne is the same man essentially in later life as in early, and through all his prose and poetry there speaks the same mind. What he wrote of his friend Mr. Tilman on taking Orders is true of himself, " Thou art the same material as before, only the stamp is changed "; and to a cursory reader only does " The Flea " seem far removed from the sonnet " Batter my heart, three-person'd God ". To those who read Donne sympathetically and long they are outputs of the same imagination, passionately sensual, passionately spiritual, blending sense and spirit with a power and a daring and a bizarre wit that belong to Donne alone. " The Flea " and others of the early poems are not the nasty verses of a coarse-minded young man; through their naked sensual fancies and youthful cynicisms run a

force of mind, a glow of imagination, a current of life, that are spiritual; Donne's awareness of the vital behind the commonplace, his sense of the mystery and unity of life and death, of the unfathomable merging of good and evil, of eternal riddles in basest matter, are shown in these " profane " poems as surely as in his later ones.

Here, side by side, are a part of " The Flea ", a " divine " sonnet, and an excerpt from a sermon:

> " Oh stay, three lives in one flea spare,
> Where wee almost, yea more than maryed are.
> This flea is you and I, and this
> Our marriage bed, and marriage temple is;
> Though parents grudge, and you, w'are met,
> And cloystered in these living walls of Jet.
> Though use make you apt to kill mee
> Let not to that, selfe murder added bee,
> And sacrilige, three sinnes in killing three ".

> " Batter my heart, three person'd God; for, you
> As yet but knock; breathe, shine and seek to mend;
> That I may rise and stand, o'erthrow mee, and bend
> Your force, to break, blowe, burn and make me new.
> I, like an usurp't town, to another due,
> Labour to admit you, but oh, to no end,
> Reason your viceroy in me, me should defend,
> But is captiv'd, and proves weake or untrue.
> Yet dearly I love you and would be loved faine,
> But am betroth'd unto your enemie;
> Divorce me, untie, or break that knot again,
> Take me to you, imprison me, for I
> Except you enthrall me, never shall be free,
> Nor ever chaste, except you ravish me ".

> " But for us that die now and sleepe in the state of the dead, we must all pass this posthume death, this death after death, nay this death after burial, this dissolution and dispersion in and from the grave, when these bodies that have beene the children of royall parents, and the parents of royall children, must say with Job ' Corruption thou art my father, and to the worme thou art my mother and my sister '. Miserable riddle, when the same worm must be my mother and my sister and myself ".

Donne's life is interesting, but Donne the poet is far more so. Reading his words, feeling their vivid life to-day, after three hundred years, reconstructing from them his personality, chewing their cud, sometimes sweet, sometimes rough, we are fascinated. Like Borrow he throws a charm over his own peculiar people, and neither Dr. Johnson nor any argument in the world can take away allegiance once given to such as these. They are there, uncopied, inimitable, admired by their own with a depth and loyalty not granted to best-sellers.

It is never possible to sift this charm for the benefit of " outsiders ", but in Donne's case, more than Borrow's perhaps, we can hint at the make-up of his strange and rare genius. Its basis is

passion, passion that saves his wit from cynicism, gives his quaint whimsies imaginative depth; intellectual passion that usually makes his verbal wanderings worth the journey (he could well have said of much of his language,

> For though thro' many straits and lands I roam,
> I launch at Paradise, I sail towards home);

spiritual passion that gives dignity to his most sensual poems and sincerity to all. Without this passion there could be no such thing as art; it is the ever-living spark that lights one age for another, kindling into sympathy far generations; in Donne this vital element saves all he writes, whether in poems, sermons, prayers, even the few letters printed for us, from the mustiness that precedes death. Sometimes it lies glowing in one phrase, as in the simple lines with the love-notes of all human centuries in them,

> I wonder by my troth what thou and I
> Did till we loved,

and in the lines—

> But when thou from this world wilt goe,
> The whole world vapours with thy breath,

where we have Donne "arrived", untrammelled by search for language.

It flashes out in his prayers. He could begin as any ordinary divine might begin, "O eternal God, who didst admit thy faithful servant Abraham" . . . but soon there speaks the poet and the mystic,

> Thou hast set up many candlesticks and kindled many lamps in me; but I have either blown them out or carried them to guide me in by and forbidden ways. Thou hast given me a desire of knowledge and some means to it, and some possession of it, and I have armed myself with Thy weapons against Thee.

It brightens letters otherwise overburdened with "the spleen of the mind"—

> All out moralities are but outworks, our Christianity is our citadel. When you contemplate Christ Jesus crowned with thorns, remember that those thorns you see stand out, hurt Him not; those which wounded Him were bent inward. Outward thorns of calumny and misinterpretation do us least harm; innocence despises them. Find thorns within—a wounding sense of sin.

It makes the beauty of the poem already quoted, "Batter my heart"; it transforms into music the short sentences and harsh-sounding words of the burning sonnet:

> Spit in my face, you Jewes, and pierce my side,
> Buffet and scoff, scourge and crucifie mee,
> For I have sinn'd, and sinn'd, and only hee,
> Who could do no iniquitie, hath dyed;
> But by my death can not be satisfied
> My sinnes, which pass the Jewes impiety;
> They kill'd once an inglorious man, but I

Crucifie him daily, being now glorified.
Oh let me then, his strange love still admire;
Kings pardon, but he bore our punishment.
And Jacob came cloth'd in vile harsh attire
But to supplant, and with gainfull intent;
God cloth'd himself in vile man's flesh, that so
Hee might be weake enough to suffer woe.

Wit is another element in his genius, a quality he has shared with other deans. His nearest clerical neighbour is Swift. There is a cynicism in much of Donne's early writings that remind one of the Dean of St. Patrick's, but it soon deepened and broadened into something worthier than brilliance. Swift's keen wit ran amuck and struck madly and vilely at himself and the whole human race; Donne's, as piercing but more sane, became a reverent insight into man's heart. In his divine poems, in his prayers and sermons, he lays bare the soul in its petty weaknesses and in its grosser sins, its small follies and its sprawling foolishness. But he does not lash like Swift, and his probings do not mangle. The human soul with its intricacies is a fascinating study for a mind of Donne's calibre. To-day, alas, we should call him a psychologist, but he was much more; he was a mystic. He knew how close sometimes are the boundaries of guilt and innocence, as are those of joy and sorrow, of beauty and terror; how easily we deceive ourselves; how clear-sighted we are to all faults but our own; how difficult even to the most saintly is spiritual concentration; how subtly mingled are base and noble passions, greed and self-sacrifice:

From being anxious, or secure,
Dead clods of sadnesse, or light squibs of mirth,

From tempting Satan to tempt us

From indiscreet humilitie

From thinking us all soule, neglecting thus
Our mutual duties
Lord deliver us.

When senses, which thy soldiers are,
We arme against thee, and they fight for sinne,
When want, sent but to tame, doth warre
And work despaire a breach to enter in,
When plenty, God's image, and seale
Makes us idolatrous,
And love it, not Him, whom it should reveal,
When we are moved to seem religious
Only to vent wit, Lord deliver us.

That we may change to evennesse
This intermitting aguish Pietie;

That learning, thine ambassador
From thine allegiance we never tempt,
That beauty, Paradise's flower
For physicke made, from poyson be exempt;
That wit, born apt high good to do,

By dwelling lazily
On Nature's nothing, be not nothing too;
That our affections kill us not—nor die—
Hear us, weak echoes, O thou Eare, and cry.

It is therefore but an imperfect comfort for any man to say I have overcome tentations to great sins, and my sins have beene but of infirmity, not of malice. For herein, more than in any other contemplation appears the greatness both of thy danger and of thy transgression. For, consider what a dangerous and slippery station thou art in, if after a battle with Giants, thou mayest be overcome by Pigmies; if after thy soul hath been cannon proof against strong tentations, she be slain at last by a Pistol; and after she hath swom over a tempestuous sea, she drown at last in a shallow and standing Ditch.

And let him that is subject to these *smaller sins,* remember, that as a Spider builds always where he knows there is most access and haunt of flies, so the Devil that has cast these light cobwebs into thy heart, knows that that heart is made of vanities and levities, and he that gathers into his treasure whatsoever thou wastest out of thine, how negligent soever thou be, he keeps thy reckoning exactly, and will produce against thee at last as many lascivious glances as shall make up an adultery, as many covetous wishes as shall make up a robbery, as many angry words as shall make up a murder; and thou shalt have dropt and crumbled away thy soul, with as much irrecoverableness, as if thou hadst poured it out all at once.

I throw myself down in my Chamber, and I call in, and invite God and his Angels thither, and when they are there, I neglect God and his Angels for the noise of a fly, for the rattling of a coach, for the whining of a door; I talk on in the same posture of praying; eyes lifted up, knees bowed down; as though I prayed to God; and if God or his Angels should ask me when I last thought of God in that prayer, I cannot tell; sometimes I find that I had forgot what I was about, but when I began to forget it, I cannot tell. A memory of yesterday's pleasures, a fear of to-morrow's dangers, a straw under my knee, a noise in mine ear, a light in mine eye, an anything, a nothing, a fancy, a chimera in my brain, troubles me in my prayer.

God is sometimes called a giant, running a race; and sometimes is so slowpaced that a thousand years make but a day with God; and yet still the same God. He hath his purposes upon our noble and vehement affections, and upon our wary and sober discretions, and will use both to his glory.

It is good that we should read old writers. Reading them we realize afresh, often with something of a shock, that what men call a modern conception has been thought and admirably expressed centuries ago. The fundamental questionings and needs of each generation are the same, and the great language of a later generation is often surprisingly like that of an earlier one. We may laugh at Donne's quaint descriptions of the final resurrection when our bones and dust, however far-flung, shall rush together at the last trump; but when he meditates on ever-recurring problems—and he was obsessed by big realities—on our dual lives, on life and death, on eternity, on the strange alchemy of right and wrong, on the mysteries

of the Christian religion, we hear in his words the familiar words of our earliest and latest writers from pre-apostolic times to Masefield. There is quoted above, " It is therefore but an imperfect comfort . . . a shallow and standing ditch "; Bunyan meditated just so. Over and over again in reading Donne's sermons there has sounded to me the voice of Alexander Whyte:

> But God never mentions, never seems to consider *that* death, the bodily, the natural death. God doth not say, live well and thou shalt die well, that is, an easy, a quiet death; but live well here and thou shalt live well for ever . . . But whether the gate of my prison be opened with an oiled key (by a gentle and preparing sickness), or the gate be hewen down by a violent death, or the gate be burnt down by a raging and frantic fever, *a gate into heaven I shall have.*
>
> In this house of his Father, thus by him made ours, there are *mansions*; in which word the Consolation is not placed in this—that some of these mansions are below, some above stairs, some better seated, better lighted, better vaulted, better fretted, better furnished than others; but only in this, that they are *mansions,* which word, in the original Latin and our language, signifies a *Remaining,* and denotes the perpetuity, the everlastingness of that state; a state but of one day, because no night shall overtake or determine it, . . . a day which yesterday doth not usher in, nor to-morrow shall not drive out.
>
> If manor thrust manor, and title flow into title, and bags pour out into chests, if I have no anchor (faith in Christ), if I have not a ship to carry me to a haven (a soul to save), what's my long cable to me?

Alexander Whyte revelled just so in making homely metaphors illuminate for ordinary congregations truths only half-perceived before.

The passionate words of the Quaker woman to Saul Kane in " The Everlasting Mercy ":

> Saul Kane, she said, when next you drink,
> Do me the gentleness to think
> That every drop of drink accursed
> Makes Christ within you die of thirst,
> That every dirty word you say
> Is one more flint upon His way,
> Another thorn about His head,
> Another mock by where he tread,

are in sympathy with poignant words of Donne three hundred years before Masefield:

> I consider, that I shall look upon him then, and see all my Sinnes, substance and circumstance of sin, weight and measure of sin, heinousness and continuance of sin, all my sins imprinted in His woundes; and how shall I be affected then, confounded then to see Him so mangled with my sins;

and in a sonnet already quoted he cries,

> They kill'd once an inglorious man, but I
> Crucifie him daily.

The strong desire of a despondent and stubborn heart for Divine quickening even through anguish is expressed in Stevenson's well-known lines:

> Stab my spirit broad awake;
> Or, Lord, if too obdurate I
> Take thou, before that spirit die
> A piercing pain, a killing sin,
> And to my dead heart run them in.

Donne pleads in like mood,

> O think me worth thine anger, punish me,
> *Burne off my rusts,* and my deformity.

Donne, we are told, was a popular preacher when Dean of St. Paul's—a "preacher in earnest"; his sermons, apart from the moving and magnificent eloquence of the great passages, are even to the modern readers works of strange power; his subjects are solemn ones—eternity, death, the fate of souls, sin and its wages; but he gathers the parts of his text one by one, analysing here, enlarging there, bringing his wit, his imagination, his sense of the beauty of language, until the whole effect, terminating often in sublime prose, is like the mustered tones of a full orchestra.

But he has never been, and never will be, a popular author, though he will always be a delight and an inspiration to his own peculiar fraternity. In spite of eloquence he will never catch the ear of multitudes. There are two reasons, bound up in each other, for this. Ben Jonson said that Donne "deserved hanging for not keeping of accent"; Dr. Johnson accused him of "a voluntary deviation from nature in pursuit of something new and strange", and of yoking "the most heterogeneous ideas by violence together".

There is ample excuse for both criticisms, and Donne's most ardent admirers must admit that he can occasionally make lamentable reading. But Donne's mind ran in unusual grooves of thought; wonder, a sense of oddness, of semblances and antitheses, of oneness in things diverse, of complexities in things apparently simple, these were always present with him and moulded his style as thought must mould style in every original artist. Dr. Johnson's accusations were deserved by Donne's imitators, but in Donne himself the style is the reflexion of the man's mind, and is inimitable without distortion. His poetry and his prose, like his thought, are full of twists and whimsies and antitheses. Often he could not have expressed himself otherwise, could not have made clear the special meaning that lies beneath his verbal meanderings. A mind that must needs brood and sift, discriminate and identify, finds directness and crystal clearness not its most sincere expression. All great art demands passion and sincerity before explicitness and rhythm, and it is but an unwitting mind and a visionless eye that spurn the works of writers, sculptors, or musicians because at first glance or hearing they are obscure. It

was not a " voluntary deviation from nature " that made Donne knit together what Dr. Johnson called " heterogeneous ideas "; to Donne death and life, sin and salvation, profane and spiritual were inevitably, not capriciously, yoked together; the fiery pillar and the cloud lead "to one end both "; " Death and Conception in mankind are one "; " therefore that he may raise the Lord throws down ";

> That cross, our joy, our grief, where nails did tie
> That All, which always was all, everywhere;
> Which could not sin, and yet all sins did bear,
> Which could not die, yet could not choose but die;

over and over again in words such as these we realize that to Donne nothing was simple, nothing isolated, nothing heterogeneous. Such esoteric characteristics of mind and style have made his writings to be stigmatized as altogether harsh and unreadable. But there are passages in both prose and poetry that even he who runs may read with delighted recognition of their sheer beauty. Chosen at random there is the debonair "The Sun Rising" :

> Busy old fool, unruly Sun,
> Why dost thou thus,
> Through windows and through curtains, call on us?
> Must to thy motions lovers' seasons run?
> Saucy pedantic wretch, go chide
> Late schoolboys, and sour prentices,
> Go tell court-huntsmen that the king will ride,
> Call country ants to harvest offices;
> Love, all alike, no season knows, nor clime,
> Nor hours, days, months, which are the rags of time.

There are lovely bits of prose, musical, unlaboured :

> . . . Now God comes to thee, not as in the dawning of the day, not as the bud of the spring, but as the Sun at noon to illustrate all shadows, as the sheaves in harvest, to fill all penuries; all occasions invite his mercies, and all times are his seasons.

There is the grave smooth dignity of the sonnet :

> Death be not proud, though some have called thee
> Mighty and dreadful, for thou art not so,
> For, those, whom thou think'st, thou dost overthrow,
> Die not, poor death, nor yet canst thou kill me.
> From rest and sleep, which but thy pictures be,
> Much pleasure, then from thee, much more must flow,
> And soonest our best men with thee do go,
> Rest of their bones, and soul's delivery.
> Thou art the slave to fate, chance, kings and desperate men,
> And dost with poison, war and sickness dwell,
> And poppy, or charms can make us sleep as well,
> And better than thy stroke; why swell'st thou then?
> One short sleep past, we wake eternally,
> And death shall be no more; death, thou shalt die.

And there is " A Hymn to God the Father ", which, though it is typically Donne-like in thought, is lucid enough in expression for

the most impatient reader; its rush of passion is not counter-checked by abstruse figures of speech; its metre, with its short last line, adds fervour to the brave but tremulous pleading, pleading (and here we can leave them reconciled) in which Dr. Johnson, especially in the last verse, would have joined Donne with tears:

Wilt thou forgive that sin where I begun,
Which *is* my sin, though it were done before;
Wilt thou forgive those sins through which I run,
And do run still; though still I do deplore?
When thou hast done, thou hast not done,
For I have more.

Wilt thou forgive that sin by which I have won
Others to sin? and make my sin their door?
Wilt thou forgive that sin which I did shun
A year, or two; but wallowed in, a score?
When thou hast done, thou hast not done,
For I have more.

I have a sin of fear, that when I have spun
My last thread, I shall perish on the shore;
Swear by thyself, that at my death thy Son
Shall shine as he shines now, and heretofore;
And having done that, Thou hast done,
I fear no more.

ELEANOR ANGLIN JOHNSON.

A SKY-PILOT'S FRIENDS.

BERT AND JOHNNIE.

When you first meet Bert you will gather the impression that your presence is somewhat distasteful to him. His manner is distant and not a little curt. Physically he is also short, with a tendency to stoutness. Years ago Bert was a cowpuncher, and though he has been farming for seventeen years his heart is still with saddle horses. It is this perhaps which gives you the impression of his being distant. He seems to look not at you but beyond you. Actually, when you get to know him, he is as open as broad daylight, and what you at first thought to be a contemptuous manner is really shyness. Yes, this sturdy, thickset cowpuncher is shy.

The first time I met him he had two weeks' growth of thick black stubble on his chin, and though he shaved at least eight times during the five months I lived with him, he always seemed to be like that. Somehow I preferred him unshaven. When his face was shorn of hair he looked too innocent and babyish, with his clear blue eyes and curly black hair. Even a shining bald pate surmounting this fringe of black curls did not dispel that uncomfortable feeling that here was a younger and a different Bert.

Bert lived on a farm. It would not be true to say he was a farmer. Many a day it has been ten o'clock before his horses have been harnessed. With twinkling eyes he explains that he does not like to work his horses in the heat of the day, and quite frequently he does not work them at all till after dinner. Bert does not get up late, but when the ten cows have been milked, the milk separated, and the pigs fed there are still the horses to get in.

This business of getting in the horses is likely to be quite exciting. Bert keeps all his horses in the small pasture over-night. There are seventeen of them to this eighty acres of pasture, but there are only six of them that he ever works. The other eleven get wilder and wilder, and it is when these come down with the other horses that the fun begins. It usually happens on some morning when Bert wants to get an early start. The horses seem to know and conspire against him. They spread to different parts of the pasture, starting off quietly enough, but when within a hundred yards of the gate they suddenly swerve round and double back before Lou, the sleepy cattle pony, has realized what has happened. Eventually, fuming and hot, Bert chases them all at the gallop into the barn. The barn, by the way, is only forty feet long and thirty wide, so then there is not much room for human beings.

No one will admit more readily than Bert that this is not the way to get in horses, but for all his swearing and shouting he is only

too happy when they give him a bit of a run. It brings back the great days when he was in the saddle from eight to thirteen hours a day.

One morning Johnnie yelled from the barn for my help. All the horses were in the barn and they were all excited. Bert was inside, walking among them as cool as he had been hot five minutes before. Johnnie was trying to keep them all in till Bert had those he needed. I was to help her. It was really a simple matter if you did not further excite the horses by getting excited yourself, but as Johnnie's assistant I soon lost all confidence in myself. She stood directly behind me with a five pronged manure fork in her hands. A horse had but to blink an eyelash and she would valiantly yell, "Whoa!" If she had kept her distance it would not have been so bad, but with every yell—and there were several—she made a forward lunge with the fork, gradually coming nearer all the time. The more I edged from her the nearer I got to the horses, which were likely to dash out any moment and impale me on her fork. It was an uncomfortable moment, and I was never nearer to making the fatal mistake of telling a woman to keep away and mind her own business than during that exciting quarter of an hour.

* * *

Johnnie, as you may or may not have gathered, was Bert's wife, and had been so for seventeen years. This long partnership had not brought that complete understanding of her spouse so necessary to domestic harmony. It was obvious that she never knew when Bert was teasing. The first time I realized this was in the spring shortly after I had arrived. Bert had hitched the team to the "democrat" (a light fourwheeled wagonette affair) and was just about to start when Johnnie called, "Where ya' going' ?"

"I'm just agoin' over t'Harper's to cuddle Mary a bit," answered Bert derisively.

"You leave that there fat hulking hussie alone or you'll hear about it, *I'll* tell the world", spluttered his wife.

Harper's was five miles away and as it was then eleven o'clock, it was very unlikely that Bert would be back before one. He had not been gone half an hour, however, before Johnnie began to look anxiously along the trail for signs of her returning spouse. The following hour was one of lively interest for me, for Johnnie, like many another prairie wife, had developed the habit of thinking aloud.

"Wonder where he is now . . . . what the divil did he want to go off like that for . . . . well, he ought to be in sight now . . . "

In the meantime I was trying to make a bookshelf out of an orange box. We were thirty miles from the railroad, just where the prairie merges into the rolling bush country bordering the northern Saskatchewan river. Our furniture and domestic comforts were few,

and so each box or packing case was carefully preserved for future use. The top shelf was finished when Johnnie, realizing that she had been thinking aloud, turned to me and said:

"Ya' know, preacher, there's one thing about me, I ain't a bit jealous".

"No?" I rather gasped.

"No, I ain't a bit jealous o' Bert, 'cos I know he wouldn't kiss any other woman but me".

And then she added under her breath, "Land's sakes, but I'd give him Hell if he did".

Jealous? Of course not. Merely solicitous for the safety of her spouse on his journey. That was why she kept gazing out of the window, muttering under her breath, only once every seven minutes and fifteen seconds by the clock. The best part of it all was that Bert, in the presence of other girls or women, was as shy and uncomfortable as a boy visiting his sister's boarding school.

* * *

I spoke of the scarcity of furniture. It was scarce, for all the money from their one good crop in seventeen years had been put into a dainty hip-roof cottage on a cement foundation. Dainty? After a thirty-mile drive past unpainted or sod shacks, it was a sight for sore eyes to come round a bend in the trail and from the top of a slight rise to see this green and white lumber cottage. It was really so tastefully painted. I did it myself. That was the outside. It was the inside which gave you the impression of hard times. In a frame house the skeleton is on the inside and there are several things you can do to cover it up. The best is to lath and plaster it. Another is to board it up with half-inch lumber, with building paper in between the boards and the studding; then you can paper the boards. But, whatever you do, never in any circumstances nail up building paper only from upright to upright. The first day it looks all right. The second day it begins to sag. Within a week it is torn in several places and dust collects and discolours it. Then some day an arithmetician, unable to "figger in his head", will turn to the handy building paper to make an estimate of the crop or the next wheat-pool payment, and soon your wall will be covered with ungainly figures. No, never allow yourself to put up building paper only. Even without anything it is not impossible to preserve a shabby gentility, but broken building paper speaks more eloquently than anything of hard times and empty purses.

There were two rooms downstairs and two up. Did I say two upstairs? That is a mistake. There was one room upstairs, divided by a piece of muslin so faded and thin that it was false modesty to have it there. It reminded me of the miser who was asked by the deaconess for decency's sake to put his boys and girls in different

bedrooms. Some time later when she called she found wire-netting across the room. As the old man explained, he had them in different rooms, but could still economize on the candles.

Downstairs in the parlour were three articles of furniture—a large cabinet gramophone, a square grand piano which had seen its best days when Noah's wife used it to play the animal chorus, and a "lunge" or settee.

It was on this "lunge" that I laid my weary bones each night and picked them up more weary still each morning. There were several hindrances to comfort. First, as Johnnie and Bert had to come through this room to go upstairs to bed, I was always the last to bed and sometimes the first up. Then again, the lunge itself was an instrument of torture which would have rejoiced the heart of a Spanish Inquisitor. To make the bed you pulled out a sliding extension and laid a horse-blanket on top. That left three mountains and two valleys. Neither valley was large enough for a whole person; consequently you spent the night on hill and dale, mostly on hill. A salt bag stuffed with straw served as a pillow, and two more horse-blankets served as sheets, blankets, and eiderdown combined. Was it any wonder that I never got more than ten hours' sleep each night?

More interesting is the piano. Johnnie has ambitions. In fact she is a social climber and it is the piano she uses as her ladder. True, she slips on the rungs now and again, but this she calls "practisin' ". She rarely forgets this while I am around, though she makes such little progress that I suspect she is only keeping up appearances. I assure you I don't encourage it.

The piano has a history, but only the last hundred and fifty years of this are known. Before Johnnie won it in a raffle it had been in the school-house. Then the trustees bought an organ, and not finding anyone who would take the piano for nothing they raffled it off at a dollar a ticket. It was a proud day for Johnnie when she drew it home four miles on the stone boat. There wasn't another piano for twelve miles around with a better tone, she said. This was quite true. There wasn't another piano! "Yes, it had a beautiful tone", she said, but it needed "toonin". With only one piano in the district there was naturally a dearth of tuners, but Bill Briggs was a wonderful hand with a violin, maybe he could do the piano. Bill was approached and promised to have a "stab at it". He came to supper, armed with a plough-wrench and pliers, and set to work. Evidently it was rather more complicated than he had anticipated. At any rate the result was strangely disconcerting. The final result was that every black note was tuned to the pitch of the preceding white one! The result of trying to run up the scale then was like climbing a ladder in which every odd rung was missing, but without being able to see this beforehand. But it made no difference with

Johnnie. She noticed nothing wrong, and always asked visitors to play a "toon". When she practised Bert and I used to go to the barn to sit among the cattle till all was clear.

Then one day a real tuner came. He had a Ford and went round the country for just such people as us. Without seeing the piano he agreed to tune and repair it for fifteen dollars, and he earned every cent of it. In that old Ford he had enough repairs for a dozen ordinary pianos, but he hadn't enough for Johnnie's. The wood holding the tuning keys was rotten and would not keep the string taut. Each one was taken out and wrapped in emery cloth. Mice had eaten away the dampers, and when the supply of felt ran out he cut up an old rabbit-skin glove and used that. Just before supper of the second day he finished tired out. After supper, however, he brightened up considerably, and sitting down on the soap-box piano stool he began to play. It was a night I shall never forget.

Perhaps the piano was tinny and weak in volume, perhaps he did not play the best music, perhaps he made many mistakes, but we did not notice it. It may have been the sweetness of what is really brackish water to the parched traveller, but for us it was a spirit of the wind carrying us all over the world in a moment of time on the wings of music. Now it was the swell of the ocean, now the storm in the valley. From there we went to "The Old Kent Road", shortly afterwards declaring that "My Gurl's a Yorkshire Gurl". "Annie Laurie" and "The Braes o' bonnie Doon" we visited. College songs, love songs, sentimental ballads, and music-hall hits of thirty years ago. Give the title, hum a few lines, and that man would play. He played "The Trumpeter" and we heard him "Calling 'em home. Come home, come home". He played parts of "William Tell", and Bert was absolutely lost in it. I saw him edging further and further forward in his chair as if on horse-back, his fingers formed to hold the lines. I was going to chaff him about it when I was amazed to find my own body working to the rhythm of the saddle. Sometimes when not moved as he was by "William Tell" I thought I saw him smiling a little cynically. It was not till half past twelve that Saturday night that he drew the recital to a close by asking me if I should have "enough puff left to preach tomorrer". Then I knew that no one had enjoyed it all more than he.

That was the parlour. In the kitchen the only interesting article of furniture was the stove. Even there there was nothing likely to strike you except the oven door, which opened downwards. It would strike you whenever you accidently kicked away the stick which served to hold it in place instead of the broken hinges. It was that door which saved us all.

My first two weeks of boarding there were very painful ones. It was quite evident that we were all on our best behaviour. Our real

selves were hidden behind a mask of unnatural politeness. In other words we were all playing the hypocrite.

It was early in May and heavy rains often kept us indoors. On just such a day we were all in the kitchen. Johnnie was cooking, Bert was peacefully smoking Old Port and I was deep in the exciting stories of Eaton's Catalogue. I had passed through the toy department and had come upon that of musical instruments. This section absorbed and puzzled me. As I tried to decide whether a Jew's Harp, a Banjo, or a Saxaphone would furnish the best medium for developing the hitherto latent genius of Beethoven I knew to be slumbering within me, I was rudely brought to earth by a loud crash. The oven door had dropped on Johnnie's toes with disastrous results to the cooking and still worse effects on her temper. I looked sympathetic, if that be possible when you are trying not to laugh. Bert grinned and Johnnie bit her lip.

"Gee, Johnnie", laughed Bert happily, "you're getting mighty self-controlled".

"Wha' d'ya' mean?" demanded the irritated woman.

"Well it's funny not to hear ya' cussin' an' swearin' now that the preacher's come to stay here".

I gasped inwardly and waited with bated breath.

"I don't never cuss an' swear".

"Garn, course ya' do. It's only 'cos Slim's here that ya' don't". Tears of pain and vexation gathered in Johnnie's eyes as she burnt her fingers on the stove plate and answered:

"I don't never cuss an' swear an' you know it".

"You know damn' well you do", jeered Bert.

"You know damn' well I don't", retorted the wrathful Johnnie with more emphasis than conviction.

I tried to look as if I were not there, and, failing lamentably, I tried to look appropriately shocked. It was no use and to Bert's delight and Johnnie's infinite relief I laughed till my sides ached. That cleared the air. From then on we were our real selves.

Those were wonderful days. It seemed as if the dreams of boyhood were being realized. Here were horses to ride and round up. Here were real live Indians, though we saw little enough of them; here were "honest to goodness" cowboys and I was riding the same horses as they. Here were pioneers in a new and as yet uncivilized part of the country, gradually making headway against the untamed prairie. Many a fantastic romance have I woven in my sentimental brain as I rode along these trails on a sturdy cayuse, and many a marvellous deed of heroism have I wrought. Even yet I can still revel in such foolish day-dreams. Yet, yet, what I remember with greatest gratitude and affection is the friendship of this lonely couple. It is not Bert and Johnnie in the weak or amusing sides of their

characters so much as Bert and Johnnie two fellow-travellers on this journey through life that I remember. Superficially there were many differences between us, but, in the true view of things, we were just three comrades on the road.

What if they were rough and ready, if Bert's language would sour milk at twenty yards, if he did once ask for the "God damned Preacher" and if he only came to church once in the summer; did he not insist on buying me a pair of boots for what little help I had given, and, what is far more important, did he not stand by me as a friend through thick and thin?

Supposing Johnnie did make a weekly batch of sour loaves and serve tough eggs, sour potatoes, and fat bacon three times a day seven days a week, did she not also send me a pair of socks at Christmas out of hard earned money? And even though she wrote a scrawly hand and addressed the parcel not to the *United* but to the *Untied* Theological College, do you think there is a present I have ever received that I value more highly than those gaudy socks I hardly dared to wear?

Bert and Johnnie, with all your lack of education and culture, with all your imperfections and *naïveté*, I am proud for the world to know that you deign to count me as a friend.

CLIFFORD KNOWLES.

THE VALUE OF FACTS.

A FRIEND of mine, in talking to a ministerial colleague, praised Dr. Rackham's commentary on the *Acts of the Apostles*. He asked his colleague, as an example of its varied information, if he knew how many persons were mentioned in *Acts*. He did not. "Two hundred and forty-two", said my friend. Then came the reply, "Is that a valuable fact?" "I liked that", said my friend in telling me; "it showed that he has got his head screwed on". I admit that it was a good debating point. It came pat and was an adroit escape. But does the argument hold good? Is it valid? I doubt it.

It reminds me of a famous story. Dr. Tucker, at one time Dean of Gloucester, observed in the hearing of Sir Joshua Reynolds that a pin-maker was a more useful and valuable member of society than Raphael.

> "That", retorted Reynolds, "is an observation of a very narrow mind—a mind that is confined to the mere object of commerce, that sees with a microscopic eye but a part of the great machine of the economy of life, and thinks that small part which he sees to be the whole. Commerce is the means, not the end, of happiness or pleasure; the end is rational enjoyment by means of the arts and sciences".

Those words are too severe to be strictly applied to the present case; but the principle is the same. Can any fact be totally valueless? Carlyle, criticizing one of Miss Martineau's American books, said that the way Daniel Webster used to stand before the fire with his hands in his pockets, was worth all the politics, philosophy, political economy, and sociology to be found in her writings. In quoting this, Mr. Birrell adds, "Give him (Carlyle) a fact, and he loads you with thanks; propound a theory, you were rewarded with the most vivid abuse". I am on the side of Carlyle in this matter, and count facts as things of value. Dr. Glover tells of a man, busy with some labour problem, of whom it was said that he was working out the problem in theory, "unclouded by a single fact"; that sort of theory has no value.

Let us test the case in dispute by a series of examples.

(1) It has been calculated that there are in the Bible 31,102 verses. From the preaching point of view this is a fact of no value, for a man will be neither better nor worse for knowing it or for not knowing it. But its value is this, *e.g.*, that it dissipates my vague notion that there are far more verses; it makes my knowledge more definite.

(2) A minister met a youth who had begun to teach in the Sunday School. The minister asked him how many Gospels there were. "Eight", said the youth. Would he mention one of the Epistles? "*Matthew*", was the reply. Did Christ live before Isaiah or after

him? The youth did not know. If the youth had been adroit, he would have said, "Are these valuable facts?", and thus hidden his ignorance of the Bible and his lack of diligence. These facts are of no value for saving souls; but a man who is saving his soul will know them.

(3) It is said there are students in Germany who will devote their time to counting the "Ands" in a book of the Bible. "Is that a valuable fact?" At first one is inclined to think not. But pause over it a moment. I would like to know, *e.g.*, how many times "And" is used in each of the Synoptic Gospels—why? Because (as I imagine) it would make more manifest the artless inartificial character of *Mark* (Look, *e.g.*, at the 15th chapter: nearly every sentence begins with "And", and the chapter is like one long sentence). That is to say, this accumulation of little facts would reveal a big and important fact.

(4) Jesus speaks of God as Father—how often? In *Mark* 5 times, in *Luke* 17 times, in *Matthew* 45 times, and in *John* 90 times. "Is that a valuable fact?" Yes, especially when it is remembered that in the *Psalms* God is never so spoken of. Comparison makes the fact valuable.

(5) Dr. Anderson Scott says[1], "It must be acknowledged that Jesus is reported as saying very little about sin under that name. It is indeed rather startling to discover that he uses the word (sin) only three times in *Mark*, five times in *Matthew*, and six times in *Luke*, or, cancelling out the parallels, only seven times in all, and on only three occasions". Is that a valuable fact? Most decidedly, although its substance is arithmetical. Even arithmetic discovers truth.

(6) Two hundred and forty-two persons are mentioned in *Acts*. Is that a valuable fact? Not for the purposes of preaching; but is this to be the only measure of value? That Dr. Rackham counted these persons shows what a keen and finished interest he took in his task; and because of this, he turned one's vague ideas into a bit of definite and handy knowledge. I had thought of *Acts* as a picturesque and populous book—that was my theory. Then my friend asks me how many persons are mentioned in it. After humming and hahing for a while, I bravely venture the guess that there are perhaps eighty or ninety—a further definition of my theory. But Dr. Rackham thickens my thin theory into 242 people, *i.e.*, more people than many a minister had in his church last Sunday. What a congregation it would be! It is valuable to realize this. It imparts substance to the adjective "populous"; it makes *Acts* far more lively and interesting; and all that is supremely worth while. The fact is valuable not merely for its own contents, but for what it represents and produces.

1 *New Testament Ethics*, p. 27.

All facts are valuable for some purpose. The one drawback is that we are sometimes too busy or too lazy to make use of them. It was recently stated that there are six times more poultry than human beings in Canada. That fact, no doubt, has some value, if only we knew how to use it. Were a man to tell me how many oak trees and chestnut trees grow in England I should be interested, and especially if he were to make a comparison with other European countries. Preachers should cherish a passion for facts as a corrective for their alleged faults. Theories without facts are of little value. Or, to paraphrase a famous saying, the fact without the theory is dumb, but the theory without the fact is empty. And what good is emptiness?

ARTHUR WAKELIN.

SCROOBY.

Respectfully dedicated to "Dum-Dum" of *Punch* who claims to perpetuate by his verses the name of the village of Scrooby, otherwise doomed to speedy oblivion now that the trains no longer stop there.

Scrooby, the famous, once the nest
  Whence issued Pilgrim Fathers,
Robinson, Brewster and the rest,
  Thy fame, one sadly gathers,
Has fallen into dim decline
Encourag'd by the railway line.

Yet liv'st thou *in perpetuum*
  (*O tempora, o mores*!)
Shrin'd in the verses of Dum-Dum,
  And takest on new glories.
Sic floret Maro, ut opinor,
Thanks to the struggles of Smith minor.

NATHANIEL MICKLEM.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

THE WORKING MAN'S CRITICISM OF THE CHURCHES.

It has been my privilege to hold informal conferences with various groups of working men, in the hope of breaking down their prejudice against the Churches. We shall never solve the problem of their alienation and hostility until we explore their minds and grasp their points of view. During the meetings the men explained their attitude by a variety of reasons, which I have classified.

The Indifference of the Churches to the Material Well-being of the Masses.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the intensity of the feeling of disappointment voiced by the men through the failure or refusal of the Churches to champion the cause of the common people in their economic and political aspirations and plans. They are certain in their own minds that Socialism is the true social expression of the ethic of Jesus. It is a constant puzzle to them how a real Christian can be anything other than a Socialist, in marked contrast to His Holiness the Pope, who recently declared that no Socialist can be a Christian. They are fully persuaded that the competitive system is anti-Christian and accursed, the main cause of tyranny, greed, class-hate and class-war, wage-slavery, poverty, and destitution. They assert that in a real Christian social order the glaring contrasts in circumstances and privileges, characteristic of our present condition, could not possibly exist. They boldly charge the Churches with an anti-Labour bias, with being the bulwark of the established order and a drag on the wheels of democratic progress, and with little or no desire for the economic betterment of the masses. There is no need for me to labour this point. In the judgment of the men political

and economic differences are responsible to a very great extent for the gulf that separates the masses from the Churches. I noticed in the groups, what I have observed so often outside them, that the more earnest and intelligent the worker, the more actively engaged in local Trade Unionism and Labour politics, the more pronounced his disappointment with and antagonism to the Churches.

The Failure of the Churches in the last War.

One naturally expected the men to refer to the attitude of the Churches in the War, for the simple reason that they had donned the King's uniform and done their bit. Some of them frankly confessed that they would never have gone of their own accord, that they hated the whole business, and that they bitterly resented the fire-eating nationalism and war-enthusiasm of some prominent members of the Churches, above military age, or in sheltered posts.

It was plain that the men believe that the Churches let them down badly, and let themselves down even worse. As one of the men put it, "The Church gave itself a knock-out blow during the War". Evidently they find it exceedingly difficult to acquit the Church of inconsistency. One group put it:

> The Christian Churches, up to 1914, were always preaching, "Thou shalt not kill!" After August, 1914, they were always preaching, "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends", which being interpreted meant, "Go and kill as many Germans as you possibly can!" Somehow they don't square.

They are bewildered also by the fact that the Christians in enemy nations were praying for victory, and claiming, as we did, a monopoly of the Divine favour and protection. They are bewildered by this schism in the Body of Christ, and this nationalizing of Almighty God.

Their criticism is not simply directed to the fact that war involves the taking of human life. They see in war the lie direct given to all that the Church teaches with respect to the standards of human conduct. War, with its lying propaganda, its worship of brute force and courage, its fostering of national pride, hate, and vengeance, its loosening of the moral restraints of civilized life, its lawlessness, its practical denial of the Sermon on the Mount: how on earth can the Church ever support such an anti-Christian method of dealing with international disputes?

These men, who went through the War, speak as men who have been through Hell, and know what it is to be poisoned by its fumes and scorched by its flames. One is not surprised that they charge the Church, frankly and contemptuously, with grave inconsistency. It is their settled judgment that the Church betrayed its trust, denied its Lord, and crucified Christ afresh in the sufferings of the common people.

The Bad History of the Church in Practical Affairs.

It was delightful to find out that two of the group were well-versed in social history. The consequence was that they asserted that the Church has a bad history with regard to the practical needs of the poor and oppressed. They knew all about the iniquitous practices of the Industrial Revolution and the indifference of the Churches in the face of the terrible exploitation of women and children of tender years for the sheer lust for gold. They knew that the Church had not only tolerated the institution of slavery, but defended it up to the last ditch. They were aware that the Church had joined hands with the landlord and tenant-farmer in the days of the Anti-Corn Law struggle, regardless of the sufferings of the poor. They asserted that the Church took the wrong side, as usual, in the General Strike, and so on.

Discussion revealed that the men believe that the Church has been so pre-occupied with theological problems as to be blind to practical affairs and the need for social reforms. They believe that if the Church had devoted the time and thought and energy to the task of applying the teaching of Jesus to the solution of the practical problems of life that it has given to the consideration of the nature of Christ's Person and other theological problems, the condition of humanity would be very much better in every respect than it is to-day. This concentration on theology and indifference to practical problems of human need means that the Church has a bad history as far as the service of the common people is concerned. This made me think furiously and long.

Class Distinctions.

Class distinctions create a real difficulty in the minds of many. I was told that working folk fight shy of fellowship with those who regard themselves as their social superiors. They object to being patronized by well-meaning people of a higher social class. They have a rooted antipathy to all forms of snobbery, and especially to the arrogance of some of the rich. They have no wish to worship with people who "cut them dead" on the street, or even refuse to speak with them on the church premises.

> You parsons preach brotherly love, and say that all men are equal in the sight of God; but nowhere are we made to feel that we belong to a lower order more than when we go to church, unless it happens to be a working-class church entirely.
>
> We prefer to go to the working men's club. We are all equal there. Nobody patronizes us. Nobody snubs us. There we find a real human fellowship, and feel quite at home.
>
> We are under our "bosses" six days a week, and are made to feel that we are "under". Thank God Sunday is our own day. We keep away from the churches, where our "bosses" are, just to feel that we are absolutely free.

These are three examples of the reasons given to me by different people outside the group. I quote them to show that class distinctions, and differences of economic status, evidently do count with some people. There are churches where the ruling power is the local manufacturer, or the big employer of labour. He is often enough a decent sort of a man. Sometimes he is otherwise. A minister told me that the "big man" of his church summed up the situation thus:

> Only a very few of my employees come to our church. I am fully aware that the few who come are toadies, trying to please me in the hope of getting something. The better sort all keep away. Why?

It would require a deal of courage on that minister's part to tell him why. Men will not be "bossed" in church, and I for one, admire them for it.

The Newspaper Exposure of Religion.

During the series of group-meetings I was informed that the Church has lost its authority. It is in the air, for science has taken its legs from under it. The Bible has been shown to be inaccurate, its history dissolved into folk-lore and myth and poetry. Jesus was only a man, the best of men it is true, but a man only.

The working man has read in the papers all about the scientific exposure of the falsity of the fundamental Christian beliefs, and while he, in common with most people, is very dubious about the truth of the Bible, he is very credulous with respect to what is stated by the press. The daily papers have informed him that our leading thinkers—save the mark!—have discovered that the Christian Faith is based on ignorance and superstition. So he knows that our dogmas are discredited, and that the miracles of Holy Writ, excepting some of the miracles of healing, never occurred. Sir Oliver Lodge has told him not to worry about his sins, but he had already ceased worrying about them. Bernard Shaw has laughed the idea of personal immortality out of court: if Bernard Shaw is terrified of being Shaw for ever, there is every reason why the ordinary man should disbelieve such a doctrine. Sir Arthur Keith has solemnly suggested that death is the end of us all; so that matter is settled. Bertrand Russell has impressed him with the fact that there is no God, and that the wisest thing to do is to make the best of this world's pleasures; "so let us eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die". Popular novelists have written articles making confessions about their religious beliefs, thus making much ado about nothing, for in the majority of cases "nothing" is the best equivalent for their religion.

The working man, in common with people of other classes, is the victim of the sensational and popular press. There is something very naïve and pathetic in the alternative that presents itself in the minds

of so many working men. For them, the Bible must either be true, altogether true, or it is false. If science teaches that the first two chapters of *Genesis* are not literally true accounts of the Creation, then the Bible has been shown to be false, and religion is based on a lie. The inherent fundamentalism in the working man's mind presents us with a problem which only a patient and sustained process of enlightenment can ever hope to solve. It is the legacy of the bibliolatry of the Reformation.

The Rivalry of the Working Men's Clubs.

The members of our group emphasized the fact that the outsider is not at a loose end on Sundays. The working man is not sitting on his doorstep, longing for an escape from boredom, yearning for some place to go to, in order to be happy. He is already attached to an institution which caters for him in a most satisfactory way. When we talk of attaching the outsider to the churches, we must understand that it will be necessary to detach him from a rival institution which he quite frequently refers to as his "church". It is the place he goes to on Sundays. Mr. R. S. Chapman, speaking before the Royal Commission on Licensing on behalf of the Working Men's Club and Institute Union, indicated the strength of this attachment of the worker to his club, in these words: "It is difficult to convey to the Commission the intense devotion of members to their club." He also testified that the attendance is largest on Saturday evenings and Sundays. It is worth noticing that he put in a plea for the sale of intoxicants in clubs at 11 a.m. on Sundays. When we remember that there are over 900,000 members in this particular Union alone, the grip of the rival institution is manifest.

There are clubs and clubs. Some of them are simply boozing places. Others are held in fine premises, costing as much as £20,000, well organized, properly managed, with real regard for decency of conduct. A few show an active interest in educational work, especially in Durham. It is beyond all dispute that clubs of the best type are an immense improvement upon the "pub", and that their members are deeply attached to them, and regard them with great pride. It is going to be no easy matter to detach the men from their clubs on Sundays and attach them to the Churches.

It is helpful to contrast the two institutions from the worker's point of view. It is not our point of view, but we must look at things through his eyes, if we wish to understand him.

Working men find in their clubs good fellowship, entertainment, and drink. They tell us that they also enjoy the sense of freedom. They wish to be free from every sort of patronage, clerical and lay, and to paddle their own canoe. Wage-slaves six days a week, they demand freedom on Sundays. They say that there is more real

fellowship in club life than in the churches, and freedom from all forms of snobbery. They speak contemptuously of the arrogance of our rich folk, of the patronizing airs of those in higher social circles than their own, and the aloofness of our cultured members, not excluding the parson. They contrast the expensiveness of Church membership with the cheapness and benefits of club membership. The club charge is usually about 4s. a year for membership, usually returned in the form of free tickets for drinks. They enjoy the benefits of coal-clubs; billiards and other indoor games are cheap, and there are sickness benefits, and excellent convalescent homes such as that at Pegwell Bay. There is great generosity shown to any member in serious trouble. There are good concerts for a nominal charge. And there are the facilities for drink. It may seem strange that one should put the club and the church into a state of rivalry, but it is true to fact to do so. The chief reason for so doing is the fact that the club flourishes on drink. Its financial stability and success is entirely due to the consumption of alcoholic liquors. The consequence is that club membership carries with it a stigma, in the opinion of our church members. I know that in many towns working men are divided into churchmen and clubmen, as if the division were into sheep and goats. The working man is either a churchman or a clubman. A comparatively few manage to be both, but not without qualms of conscience.

We discussed the pull of the Club in our own little town, of about 5,000 inhabitants. It has a membership of 730, fine premises, a very large bar-room, a large concert hall, a billiard room with three tables, a very tiny reading room, a nice room where a young man can bring in his young lady for a chat and a drink, and several other rooms for games. It is well managed and well conducted. It has no financial difficulties. It has no educational activities worth mentioning. During the last four years the bar receipts amounted to the sum of £27,660. It is noteworthy that the bar receipts show a decrease each year. This may be attributed to bad trade conditions and the pull of the local cinema, but also to the fact that the younger members are not drinking much, and some of them not drinking at all. The old steady drinkers regard these as disloyalists, who by their abstinence threaten the financial stability of the club. Our Ministers' Fraternal, which includes the Vicar, has obtained permission to send its members to the bar-room for the purpose of giving a religious address once a month. We are given a very hearty welcome and a most attentive hearing. But we have not succeeded in getting a single one of the club devotees to attend our Sunday Services.

It is the opinion of the group that men will not respond to our appeal, for they find in the Club freedom, warm fellowship, and the kind of entertainment they desire. This shows how

essential it is for us to seek contact with them, and endeavour to serve them, on their own ground. Not only did the members of our group give their own reasons for abstention, along the lines already indicated, but they explained the attitude of the less thoughtful and more ignorant type of working man. Some of the things that tell against the Church in the minds of such men may seem to us petty and trivial, yet we must take notice of them if we wish to deal properly with this difficult and complex problem. It really is essential for us to understand the ordinary working man's point of view.

The Cleavage of Culture.

Our group was emphatic in its assertion that culture created a real difficulty in the mind of the ordinary man. He is even less happy in the presence of the better educated person than he is in the presence of the rich. He is oppressed by the feeling of inferiority in knowledge and power of expression, and fights shy of the individual who uses a language above his ken. It is the opinion of the group that the language of the pulpit is usually far too high-flown and technical. They declare that the preacher who wishes to attract working men into his church must speak in a simple, direct, and less sophisticated style. He must also avoid abstruse subjects, and deal with the ordinary problems of practical life.

Obviously the only remedy for this lies in greater educational facilities for the children of the working class.

The Conception of the Kill-Joy Church.

Many of the working class still retain the idea that the Church stands for a sombre view of life and conduct. It represents certain repressive and narrowing ideas, which make life an altogether serious business and kill all joy, save the joy of being numbered among the chosen and saved. It seems to them that religion was most certainly designed to make our pleasures less. They are uncomfortably aware of the negative tone of the teaching and witness of the Church, and deaf to most of its positive notes.

They will tell you that the trouble with the Church is that it teaches that everything pleasant, everything that the working man likes doing, is wrong.

> We want to be happy and to enjoy ourselves, but the Church wants to make us feel miserable. If we go to the club, and drink a glass or two of beer at the close of a hard day's work, we are looked down upon, and regarded as sinners in the sight of God and man. If we put a bob on a horse just to have the thrill of a little flutter, we are wrong. If we organize a dance, to brighten up a dreary winter's day, we are doing something that is immoral and wrong. If we spend an hour or two on our allotment on a Sunday, again we are doing wrong. If we go for a chara ride to the sea-side on the Sabbath day, to enjoy

the country-side as we go along, and to drink in the tonic sea-air, it's all sinful and wrong. If we go to the "talkies" more than once a week, we are wrong. Every blessed thing that we really enjoy doing is condemned by you Church folk. The only right thing to do, according to you, is to attend Church twice on Sundays, and a prayer-meeting during the week. It's too "kill-joy" this religion of yours. The most active persons in the churches are narrow-minded, bigoted and censorious people. It's the intolerance of your teetotallers that gives an extra flavour to our beer.

Modern Travel Facilities.

The wonderful facilities for Sunday travelling in the form of cheap excursions by road and rail increasingly tend to keep multitudes of working men and their families away from the churches. The ordinary working man, bored stiff by the conditions of machine labour, or the monotony of manual work, with his imagination fired by the "talkie", finds in Sunday travel a delightful avenue for freedom, adventure, variety, and pleasure. It enables him to get away from drab surroundings, and see "God's own country". He finds it a means of refreshment for body and mind. His one week's holiday in the year is often a "wash-out" through bad weather. These little Sunday breaks in the monotony of life make it good to be alive. The group pointed out the fact that several of the elect have yielded to the attraction of a Sunday trip to Blackpool, and prophesied that many more of them will eventually summon up courage to do the same.

The Heavy Cost of Church Membership.

One was told that the question of the financial obligations of Church membership acted as a deterrent with many. The old free-will offering was being replaced in many churches by the "weekly envelope" system. This may be quite satisfactory for people with regular and large incomes, but it is no easy matter for a working man—often having to work "short-time,' and perhaps having spells on the "dole"—to promise to contribute a certain sum regularly to the church funds. The working man thinks that his home needs ought to come first, and in these days his home often requires his all. Moreover, churches are constantly appealing for extra gifts for all sorts of outside causes. Then there are always tickets to buy for this concert, or tea, or social, and donations for bazaars, *etc.*, so that the working man is perpetually being asked to put his hand into his pocket. It hurts his pride to have to refuse, but what can a man do when his pocket is practically empty? Again, the working man believes that people should give as God hath blessed them, and they assert that the rich are not giving, relatively speaking, as much as the poor. In far too many churches the funds depend on Sales of

Work, Bazaars, concerts and socials, and the rich are not taxed as heavily by these things as the poor. Sometimes it seems to the working man that the rich members are busily engaged in organizing ways and means of getting money out of him without contributing much themselves apart from their expenditure of time and energy. It is the opinion of many working men that if Church members gave in proportion to their means there would be no financial difficulties, and the working class would not be driven away by too many calls on its purse.

It was pointed out by the men of the group that the worker is taxed for many other purposes, such as his contributions to the State schemes for old age pensions, sickness and unemployment benefits, Trade Unions, local charities, hospitals, *etc.* They asserted that there is very little margin left to meet the many calls that come through connexion with a place of worship.

Charge of Inconsistency against Church Members.

Our group was positive that the presence of some people in prominent positions in our churches kept many thoughtful working men away. Mr. S. is a deacon, but they know him for a hard taskmaster, a bullying foreman, a shady character, a money-grabber, a promotion-seeker, a hypocrite, and so on. They are not going to worship in the same church as such a man. It is curious to notice in this connexion that one unworthy official seems to exercise an expulsive power far stronger than the attractive power of a dozen righteous men. We are all familiar with these abstentions on personal grounds. We find them chiefly in those churches where the men are invited to worship with their employers.

This seems to be a very prevalent complaint against the churches. A friend of mine with several years' experience of club debate among the shipyard apprentices in Southampton writes as follows:

> Everything is worked out from the point of view of the daily life in the yard. They argued from the next one in superiority to them. They were full of details as to the practices of the foremen, chargehands, managers, supers, and proved to their own satisfaction that none of these gave a square deal. Ulterior motives predominated particularly in those who professed church attendance. It all boiled down really to an attack on the sincerity of those who do attend church, especially those in office over them.

The Dullness of the Ordinary Church Services.

It came out that the working man complains that the Sunday services are usually dull affairs. The whole atmosphere is too solemn, and the effect is to bore him stiff or to make him feel miserable. He believes in having a good time and being happy, when he goes anywhere. He has a good time at the club, the football match, the

"talkie", the playhouse. Indeed he enjoys himself wherever he goes, except when he puts in an attendance at church, which he may do once in a way. Whenever he does so, he registers a silent vow not to go again for a long time. The whole business is a great strain, and its effect upon him is similar to that of a funeral upon a village undertaker and his satellites, who hasten to recover their spirits in the village inn as soon as their depressing job is over. The remedy they prescribe is that of brightening up the services. Let the hymns be sung to tunes that go with a swing and a lively chorus. It doesn't matter what the words are about. They like a good sing when they go to church. Let the sermons be topical and short. They do not want to listen to dry discourses. Nor do they want sermons that make them feel they are miserable sinners in need of forgiveness, or condemn them for drinking a glass of beer, or doing a little gambling, and such like things. If the preacher wants to preach about sins, then they can really enjoy a sermonic onslaught on the sins of society, the idleness and luxurious living of the rich, the rottenness of the present social and economic order, the callous conduct of the capitalist, and such like themes, which they find very thrilling and palatable. And

> let the preacher look them in the face, and get the stuff straight off his chest in simple words, instead of reading it out of a book as it were; and let him put in a joke or two, just to raise a smile or a laugh, to relieve the tension, and make them feel that they are really having a good time.

The blunt truth is that the demand of the working man is to be entertained in church rather than edified, amused rather than exhorted, pleased rather than provoked to self-examination and amendment of life. Sister Dora loved to worship in a certain church in Wednesbury because the Vicar preached in such a way as to make her feel very uncomfortable about her spiritual condition and her manner of life. The ordinary working man has a strong objection to being made to feel uncomfortable about himself, and keeps away from church lest he should be made to feel so. Is there not something radically wrong with the working man?

J. W. James.

THE EMPTY CHURCH—A PENALTY OF INTELLECTUAL INCOMPETENCE.

The fact that the outward observances of religion are somewhat discredited does not mean that the essentially religious desire for some adequate direction, which will link our lives with the stars and give us an aim beyond the trivialities of every day, is dead. On the contrary, it is very much alive. A great deal of what the moralist

reprobates as pleasure-seeking is really a fevered search for something to fill the void in life which has been left by the decay of authoritative direction; and religion—even theological religion—is still one of the most attractive topics of public discussion. Someone has said that those who have been praying for a religious revival are actually living in the midst of one, but that because of the lack of emotional scenes they do not recognize it for what it is.

The failure of the Church is rightly ascribed to its inability to promulgate fearlessly any moral code consistent with the teachings of its Founder. Both on the side of private morality, exemplified by sex, and on that of public morality, exemplified by war, the Church's testimony fails to carry conviction. In the latter case this failure is really a failure of courage; the Church preaches non-resistance in theory, and then when the practical test arises fails to follow to the bitter end the logic of her own teaching.

All this is perfectly and lamentably true; as also is the natural consequence that ordinary people are unable to take seriously an institution which continually compounds with its conscience and tries to make the best of both worlds. The implied accusation, which is made explicitly in the present article, is that the failure of the Church is really a failure of intellectual competence and courage. It is of no use pretending to have the secret of life everlasting—not only beyond the skies, but here and now—unless one has also the courage of relentless logic. It is of no use pretending to have power to solve all the riddles of human life when on most of the problems which distress mankind one is without chart or compass.

At the time of the Reformation the Church was dethroned from her ancient position as the moral dictator of Christendom. She was dethroned, not simply because her ordinances stood in the way of men who wished to satisfy their greed for gain, though her declared principles did in fact occupy that position. Had that been her only handicap, she would have survived with her influence unimpaired. Since mankind is never friendly to greed in the abstract, and since the common man can always be roused against the cupidity of those who amass great riches, the Church might well have rallied all common humanity against the profiteer, and become the leader of an ideal civilization instead of the captive of a materialistic one.

The real trouble was that while preaching against usury, which she rightly considered to be wrong, she failed to distinguish between oppressive profit-taking and that new practice of lending at interest which made possible the aggregations of capital essential to the exploitation of new knowledge. Moreover, so uncertain was she in her own mind that even while she condemned usury with her mouth, and conceived the condemnation as applying also to legitimate commercial accommodation, her princes themselves borrowed at

interest. From lack of clear-headedness she became a blind leader of the blind, so that both she and her charge fell into a ditch, while men were unable to respect a priesthood which was neither lucid nor intellectually courageous.

In the same way, when in the course of last century biological science produced the great and vivifying conception of organic evolution, and set mankind between the vast perspectives of past and future, the Church could for years see nothing more in the new ideas save that they made nonsense of the Babylonian account of creation, which she was unable to distinguish from the reality of religion. Thus another great enlightenment found her in futile and muddle-headed opposition, fighting what was quite obviously a rear-guard action against men more intellectually competent and more clear-headed than her own leaders. She went down to defeat under the sledge-hammer blows of Huxley and the rapier thrusts of Samuel Butler. Now she has made her peace with evolution; but it is the peace of the camp follower, if not of the captive. The essentials of her faith may actually be untouched—I think they are, so far as that particular discussion goes—but her reputation for leadership has suffered disastrously.

In her treatment of almost any modern problem one may choose to cite, the Church still suffers from the same defect. She becomes the repository of conservatism, moving not with, but far behind, the times. Her contribution to the clash of Labour and Capital—perhaps the most world-shaking conflict of modern times—is almost nothing save a few banalities about living in peace. Of the vital issues of economics and finance which underlie that titanic struggle, her priesthood is childishly ignorant. To the problems which face the thoughtful and well-intentioned business man a dozen times a day she can make no contribution. The decalogue which is incorporated in her service—the only categorical and detailed code to which she is committed—is ludicrously inadequate to present-day life. It is suited to a primitive agricultural community; but to most of our moral problems to-day it has nothing to say. It is as if one were to ask for a Bradshaw and be offered instead the uncertain itinerary of the Magi.

One listens with growing amazement and apprehension to discussions of marriage in assemblies of clergymen and ministers. It never seems to enter the heads of these reverend gentlemen that the world of to-day differs in any essential particular from the world of needless suffering and premature death in which took shape the neolithic conception of marriage which has been the accepted basis of sexual ethics for several thousand years.

Malthus was a parson; yet his successors of to-day would seem never to have heard of over-population or the Law of Diminishing

Returns. With all the industrial countries of the world in the grip of recurrent crises of unemployment, with all Central and Eastern Europe pre-occupied with the strife of town and country, of industry and agriculture—problems in which over-population is an essential factor—these would-be leaders of mankind can still talk as though the only purpose of marriage were the production of children. Meanwhile, the practice of the world sweeps past them. No doubt when it becomes painfully obvious that they themselves are resorting to birth control and using contraceptives, the Church will make another accommodation, as she has done with evolution and commercial interest; but this is not leadership, and no sane person is going to look for direction to an institution which, like her earliest members, "follows a great way off".

The fact is, of course, that parsons are not trained for leadership at all. They are nurtured in a backward-looking tradition, not in forward-looking science. They know some of the things which have happened, and none of the things which are happening to-day. Modern religion needs to be adventurous, and the leaders of the Church offer nothing but a refuge—an ill-lit funkhole where the timorous may hide from all new and surprising and exciting things. The trouble is not that religion is dead, but that our ostensible religious leadership is pitifully feeble, incompetent, and uninspiring.

We have perhaps little right to complain of these parsons. They are disappointing enough but we cannot reproach them on the ground that someone else is doing their job for them and doing it better. One of the great lessons of the Reformation, in its repudiation of the moral dictatorship of ecclesiastics, is just that such dictatorship is impossible. There is not, and indeed there cannot be in a world like this, any one institution which justly claims dictatorial authority over men's moral lives. The world is too complex; and it was just that growing complexity which destroyed the ancient autocratic priesthood to make way for the "priesthood of all believers". Man to-day must find his moral direction in many ways —in the growing leadership of science, in literature and art, in the moral intuitions of his own heart, and in the teachings of those great prophetic souls whose words are part of the unchanging treasure of humanity.

We ought perhaps to forgive the Church her incompetence, since we are not conspicuously competent ourselves. It is her pretentiousness, her claim to knowledge and authority which she does not and cannot possess, which we cannot forgive.

Louis A. Fenn.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

> There is a strict Affinity between all Things that are truly laudable and beautiful, from the highest Sentiment of the Soul, to the most indifferent Gesture of the Body.
> *The Spectator, 25 August,* 1712.

I.

I PROPOSE to put what I have to say in a personal form, because in a matter of this kind experience inevitably affects one's judgment as to what is appropriate.

One of the most powerful memories of my childhood is that of being a spectator at the Communion. In those days it was customary for the minister to invite non-communicants to take seats apart from the latter to witness the service. As a little boy I often went with others of my family into the big end gallery of the church (Lewisham High Road, London) and watched the Communion celebration with an interest that sometimes became a real emotion. The area of the church was generally filled with communicants. The choirmaster and such other members of the choir as were also members of the Church had special seats allotted them near to the table. After they had taken their places there was quietness for a few moments, and then came the procession from the vestry of the twelve deacons and the minister, who was always robed with gown, cassock, and bands. The hymns were sung unaccompanied and the absence of organ music created on my mind the impression of something immediate and naked, in the approach to God. Scripture, or more often, a brief address relating the theme of the sermon in the previous service to the holy Supper, the words of institution, and prayer followed the opening hymn, in much the same way as we practise now. But the outstanding feature of the service was the symbolic acts of eating and drinking, and here a difference emerges. What differentiated this part of the celebration from the present ritual was the beauty and solemnity which marked participation. My childish eyes were fascinated, as I think my man's eyes would be still if the service remained as it was, by the appointments of the table—the many silver vessels drawing to themselves the half-lights of the church, whilst the contrast between the black gown of the minister, as he silently moved to and fro behind the table with its fair white linen, gave just that touch of austerity which the symbolism of the Supper should always include. Slowly, pew by pew, and with almost complete silence the great congregation partook of the bread and the wine. One after another they bowed in prayer. The servers were themselves served. Last of all, the minister partook and then the silence was complete. That hush seemed to shroud

possibilities of a heavenly intercourse. It set me dreaming and wondering what angels might be. In the stillness I remembered my sins, I thought upon Christ dying for me, I began to love Him then.

So the service used to be—simple, chaste, beautiful, and infinitely suggestive. I never find it like that now, and the cause is not, I think, that I am self-deceived and have idealized the past, for, as I said at the first, my memory here is powerful, but the cause is the change in our methods.

Before discussing these I offer, with much respect for those who differ from me, some simple observations concerning the nature of a sacrament. Of course many material things are capable of a spiritual usage. But in Free Church worship there are only two services in which such things are thus employed—Baptism and the Supper. In each of these we use one or more material objects and perform definite acts. Each, therefore, has the nature of drama, and in drama it is essential that actions should be fitting. Anything that is ugly, grotesque, or petty, ruins a drama that is religious, because beauty is an attribute of God. In the pathetic drama of the Supper this is the more evident because of the silence with which we seek to encircle each act of participation. Any gaucherie, or slovenliness, anything which suggests triviality, anything which in itself is unlovely, negates, or diminishes, sacramental efficacy. Where poverty imposes the use of rude vessels there may be compensation through the very realization of material destitution thus made evident, and in other cases too it is not to be denied that the communicant, by shutting his eyes to the faultiness of the technique and by a resolute effort of his spirit, may attain at such a time to a real fellowship with his Lord. But if in this he succeeds it is in spite of the action of the service, rather than through it, and he could do the same in a prayer-meeting, or, indeed, perhaps by himself at home. Sacramental action which is not fitting and beautiful and appealing is of no value. That, at least, is a Free Church view of the matter. An Anglo-Catholic, or a Roman Catholic, could afford to be slovenly or clumsy, because he believes that the utterance of certain words by a properly appointed person brings the Divine Presence into the bread and the wine: there is a miracle effected which is independent of symbolism, poetry, or beauty. That is an intelligible position, although as the 28th of the Anglican Articles declares, it "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament". Our Congregational position, on the other hand, is concerned with the Supper as a sacrament, and from this it follows that the way in which we communicate—the character of our gestures, the loveliness or unloveliness of the material apparatus we use—is of essential importance. If any one thinks that to do this and that, simply because our Lord said, *Do this in remembrance of Me,* is the whole of our

concern, he is in bondage to a legal conception of religion and really is not remembering his Lord but forgetting Him all the time. The more truly we remember Him, the more must we become impregnate and instinct with the sense of fittingness and of that marriage of the seen and the unseen which is the most outstanding feature of His uttered mind. I come to this—that in none of our services is form of such vital importance as in the Supper.

How is it that the Communion yields so little to many of us?—for I am convinced that large numbers of our members feel as I do. What is it we have lost? I believe much has simply evaporated through decay of faith in Christ's sacrifice on behalf of sinners. But that does not lie within the scope of the present article, which is concerned with administration rather than with doctrine. It is in administration we have lost. This has come about through the substitution for the old beautiful chalices of a trivial and almost grotesque apparatus, an apparatus, too, which symbolically is quite wrong. It began with the objection to alcoholic wine. As long as we used wine such as, in Scripture language, *maketh glad the heart of man,* the possibility of contamination through the common cup was not very serious, and rightly-minded people who happened to be suffering in their mouths passed the cup untasted. But temperance people, no doubt, were justified in their objection. When the unfermented wine was introduced a taint speedily became evident, the hygienic question grew pressing, and once that was publicly raised there was only one way of answering it. So we have come to the unbeautiful stacks of trays with minute cups, suggestive of the laboratory of a chemistry class, or, as one of our older ministers (an ex-Chairman of the Union, too) once expressed it—a doll's tea-party. The external beauty of the service which ought to be of value to us has gone. But there is worse than that. These multitudinous cups thrust upon us the fissiparous and over-individualized character of much of our Nonconformity. To partake of a common cup is to symbolize community; to partake of individual cups symbolizes individualism. It was to set forth unity that the Early Church celebrated as it did. *The cup of blessing which we bless is it not a communion* (κοινωνία) *of the body of Christ* (1 *Cor.* 10^{16})? That scripture has a very diminished relevancy for us now. When we could drink of a common cup there was a spiritual beauty in the act, because it harmonized so fully with a human instinct. How often has one seen a very little child at table thrust its crust to its mother's mouth, or offer its cup, with some broken baby-speech, to its mother's lips, that she might share the very same food it relished so much. No cleaner crust or cup would suit so well, just because it would not be the same. The Communion rite, as it was handed down to us, was essentially a child-like thing, based upon Oriental

habits of eating and drinking together. Our modernization of it is simply a profane thing, and there can be no wonder that to many it is not a help, but rather a challenge to our nature to be spiritual without consecrating the external. Worst of all, these ugly stacks of cups suggest the very opposite thing to that which the service is intended to commemorate. The sacrifice of Christ was an utterly self-forgetting thing. Our individual cups are designed in the interests of self-protection. You cannot *shew the Lord's death* by drinking out of a vessel specially designed to save your body from disease. In the attempt you reach a confusion of ideas which obscures the whole object of the celebration.

I suppose that it has been through the working of some secret feeling of a forfeited unity that in many of our churches participation has been made simultaneous—in a few instances even in respect to the bread, in many more in respect to the wine. I wonder whether others have the horrid feeling which is apt to invade myself at such a time that I am at a public banquet, toasting a popular man, and that I really ought to stand and drink. At its best a synchronism of this kind is a bad substitute for the common cup. It is a bustling attempt to say, "All one body we". When we drank from a common cup we practised unity with one another in proper subordination to the more august reality of our personal oneness with Christ. Our new simultaneity, even when most effectively drilled, takes the last vestige of homely beauty from the service, and unless I shut myself up to silent meditation, ignoring the procedure, as far as possible, an occasion which should be one of fruition becomes arid and irritating.

II.

What is to be done? Personally, I would gladly go back, taking all the risks, which I suspect have been magnified. But, of course, since few or none would accompany me, that is impossible. Temperance and hygiene utterly bar the way. Further, no artist has arisen to fashion for us any vessels of beauty, and even if one did the principle of the individual cup, as I have shewn, is wrong. What I suggest is something which will be considered drastic. Before I state it I must roughly premise the character and extent of our freedom to reform.

Unquestionably the Supper goes back to Apostolic times. Some would contend that our Lord Himself ordained it as a perpetual rite for His people. That is a contention which is open to great doubt. Whatever significance attaches to the words of institution, the genius of Christ's Gospel was too impregnate with spiritual freedom for Him to be likely to lay upon His Church any ritual obligation whatsoever, and this, despite *Matt.* 28^{19}, I believe applies to Baptism as well as to the Communion service. A communal

autonomy, guided by faith in God, is the key to all His teaching. I believe He left His Church quite free to work out its own life through the Holy Spirit given in His name. Two things follow from this position. In the first place, the Church is at liberty, if a spiritual convenience require it, to re-shape the Communion service according to modern experience. In the second place, in such re-shaping we should preserve the largest possible measure of continuity with the past, and of community with contemporary believers. In this matter Quakerism, unless based upon an inevitable conscientious objection, is an aberration both from the Church and from Christ. Therefore we cannot do without the service.

Thus the problem before us calls for an expression of the Eucharist in a manner which avoids both unhygienic methods, on the one hand, and symbolically untrue methods, on the other.

What, then, is the reality to be set forth? It is surely the abiding reality of Love's devotedness—the giving of the selfhood of Christ in uttermost loneliness and sorrow, that He might bear the sin of the world according to the will of God. This we both celebrate and receive. We do more than show that amazing death. We absorb it. And as we absorb it we grow into that Divine reality which is therein revealed. Just as the material food by which we are nourished becomes a part of our very life, so by our contemplation of, and faith in, the dying Christ we receive Christ and, becoming Christian, throw down the barriers which separated us from our fellows and henceforth are members of a new and super-terrestrial Body.

Such is the fundamental truth which no Catholic would deny, although he might add to it things which Free Churchmen could not accept. This is the essential fact the historic Christian religion, as apart from its various backwaters and side streams—Unitarian, Quaker, Christian Science, and the rest—, has always held. And this surely we are at liberty to express without being tied to the very form of the original Supper in the upper room, either as to the things done or the things said. To be explicit, the "words of institution"—I use the phrase for convenience not as accepting its implication—need not fetter us.

Would it not then be enough to observe the Communion in one kind only, as our Roman brethren do? That is my proposal.

I suppose it will be objected that this is to renounce an important item in Protestant propaganda. Is that really to be decisive? The withholding of the cup from the laity originated in the twelfth century as a matter of convenience in connexion with the good custom of admitting children to the Eucharist. A child might spill the wine. Then experience suggested that others besides children could be clumsy. Hence it was deemed sufficient to give to the laity only the bread. Undoubtedly the sacerdotalists made capital out of this

question of convenience, and Communion in both kinds for the priesthood alone enhanced the dignity of the priest. But the freedom of spirit shown in this departure from the letter of ancient tradition was worthy of Christ's disciples. And further, on the medieval pre-supposition of a real though veiled Presence of Christ in the elements, there was something peculiarly sublime in the teaching of Aquinas, which I understand is the Roman faith to-day, namely[1], that the

> whole Christ is present entire in each species, and in every fragment of each species, the body being present by concomitance in the species of the wine, and the blood being present by concomitance in the species of the bread.

Such a belief lifts the doctrine of transubstantiation into a mystical region where neither argument nor objection have relevancy. The value of the teaching of Aquinas for us who do not accept transubstantiation lies in its suggestion of a certain breadth of treatment. Material quantity ceases to determine the value of the Communion. Such a position harmonizes with our Congregational dislike of immersion in Baptism. One who has the historic spirit of Congregationalism in his very bones recoils from literalisms and blind adhesions to antiquity, whilst at the same time he controls his recoil by sympathy with all his fellow-Christians.

In the matter before us, the suggestion I make would lift us out of a disagreeable and unhappy position into one nearer Catholic practice, and this without removing us so far from the Protestantism of Luther as at first might appear. The early Protestant objection to Communion in one kind was due, not so much to a regard for literal conformity to our Lord's words at the Supper, as to an objection directed against the sacerdotal perversion of what had been originally a mere matter of convenience. If Aquinas was broad, so also in his later age was Luther. Clearly he claimed for the Church a large freedom of action in respect to all religious technique, whether public or private. Concerning Communion in one kind only as of kindred things, "the great matter" for him "was the spirit in which such things were performed or left undone[2]". He was not indifferent to form, but he rightly saw that spirit should govern form, and Paul's *Galatians* taught him (as it has not yet sufficiently taught ourselves) that the spirit of adoption is a free spirit.

Perhaps the most conspicuous weakness of the Congregational churches just now is their bondage to tradition, and by tradition, of course, I do not mean what they dislike in the Episcopal churches; I mean rather the tradition of that very dislike, and their fears and stereotyped antipathies—things handed down from our fathers—and perhaps most of all the timidity which arises out of this, a timidity

[1] *E.R.E., V.* 559.
[2] T. M. Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, I. 437.

which hinders us from adventuring new forms in worship, so that taking all things into account we have to confess that we know little of Paul's great saying, *I . . . died unto the Law, that I might live unto God* (*Gal.* 2^{19}).

It remains to indicate in a tentative way the order of worship suitable in a Communion service which is only what the earliest Communions were in name—a service for the *breaking of the Bread* (*Acts* $2^{42, 46}$, $20^{7, 11}$).

After a short series of introductory sentences, or, occasionally, the recital of what has been called *John's* "alternative sacrament", the story of the washing of the disciples' feet (*c.* 13), there should follow a hymn and various prayers, including always a prayer for the blessing of all "the departed". Then *Mark's* narrative of the Last Supper should be read. The *Salvator Mundi* (*Congl. Hymnary* 786) and the *Gloria in Excelsis* (787) might be sung in all but the smallest and least instructed of our churches: they are amongst the most beautiful of Christian hymns. After this the following Scripture could be introduced by the words, *Jesus said*: *John* $6^{27\text{-}29, 33, 35, 37, 48, 51, 63}$. The Bread should then be distributed as quietly as possible, and all communicants given a few moments for private prayer. The silence should be a gradual and slowly deepening thing, broken away from at last by some triumphant hymn of praise suggestive of our Lord's victory and risen splendour. During this singing the offerings might be collected, and be placed by the minister upon the table in such a way as not to mar the beauty of its appointments. These are often insufficiently considered. Suitably embroidered napkins to cover the silver plates of bread are preferable to the vast white cloth which so often at present shrouds the table up to the opening of the service. Flowers in specially designed vases and a silver stand for the minister's books would enhance the loveliness of the service for those who are ready to receive spiritual suggestion through the eye as well as through the ear. Finally, the seats of the minister's assistants ought to be so placed as to avoid physical inconvenience or crowding, and so that they too as well as others can kneel in the times of prayer.

It will be a strange thing if amongst the readers of this paper no one is moved to irritation or contempt by the enumeration of these details. But the ordering of any part of public worship requires a careful consideration of things which separately may be small but collectively affect our profit. We Nonconformists are apt to think ourselves spiritually-minded persons in proportion as we are able to transcend technique. I submit that there we are wrong. We have been led into such a disproportioned emphasis upon the spiritual that finally we fail in spirituality, losing the very thing we seek. For the spiritual is at its greatest, not when it ignores the material, but when it glorifies it.

> Let us not always say
> "Spite of this flesh to-day
> I strove, made head, gained ground upon the whole!"
> As the bird wings and sings,
> Let us cry "All good things
> Are ours, nor soul helps flesh more, now, than flesh helps soul!"

I suspect we have been misled by a false psychology. As I write there lies before me in a recent issue of *The Expository Times* a reminiscence of Dr. Parker.

> "Has man a soul?" was the query of a placard in the street, and Dr. Parker seeing it, thundered that day his answer: "No! He *has* a body; he *is* a soul."

Dr. Parker's thunderings seldom had much relation to the fullness of truth. The proper answer to the question he encountered would be, He *is* body and soul. The Christian religion, with its consummate message of the Resurrection as something more than spiritual survival, is in full accord with those facts observed of the body's fellowship with the mind which shew how every thought we entertain is accompanied by a modification of the brain. And just because our religion has as its key-note *The Word became flesh*, and as its final hope for individual life the gathering together of all our spiritual realizations in a form corresponding to Christ's risen body, so our worship is always more than a thought, more than an emotion, more even than a volition: it unfolds from the spirit into bodily action and gesture and involves the consecration of the apparatus of expression. Our frequent failure to realize these things is one of the causes which have led educated men and women, especially amongst the young, to forsake our assemblies for those where a more decorous ritual is observed. There is no warrant either in the teaching or in the practice of Christ for indifference to devotional form. He who when He cleansed His Father's house of prayer from its busy traffickers *would not suffer that any man should carry a vessel through the Temple* (*Mk.* 11^{16}), *i.e.*, would not permit anyone to make a mere convenience or passage way through the sacred courts, would certainly not sanction any indifference to questions of seemliness in the worship of His Church. Our Nonconformist witness to spiritual reality has been in the main a splendid thing, but many of us have forgotten that the Christian religion is essentially a sacramental religion, one therefore that claims whatever services art can render, or if art is too ambitious a term in this connexion, at the very least a careful employment of what is outwardly fitting as the chalice of our secret joy.

Any attempt to reform the Communion Service involves its relation to the Sunday morning worship. Early Communions, before the bank-holiday racket on the road begins, have a peculiar sweetness. They should be encouraged wherever a reasonable number of

members can attend. Perhaps, however, most people find mid-day the more convenient time. I suggest that when Communion follows the regular morning service the latter should not occupy more than 45 minutes. It might even be well to omit the sermon, or else to make the children's talk (where that is customary) a preparatory address for children and adults leading up to the Communion. In any case communicants should not be invited to enter into the most solemn service of the Church, otherwise than in an attitude of eager expectation. I would give very much indeed to have the opportunity of sharing in a celebration of the Lord's Supper, when all gathered with me might realize something of that wonderful sense of an approaching Presence which Walter Pater describes in his *Marius the Epicurean*[1] as the characteristic feature of the Eucharist in the second century:

> *Adoramus te Christe, quia per crucem tuam redemisti mundum*!—they cry together. So deep is the emotion that at moments it seems to Marius as if some there present apprehend that prayer prevails, that the very object of this pathetic crying himself draws near. From the first there had been the sense, an increasing assurance, of one coming:—actually with them now, according to the oft-repeated affirmation or petition, *Dominus vobiscum*! Some at least were quite sure of it; and the confidence of this remnant fired the hearts, and gave meaning to the bold, ecstatic worship, of all the rest about them.

Or I would give almost as much to savour again the Lord's grace at the Supper, in the measure possible to a spectator, as from afar—a little one at the gates of the Kingdom—I looked upon it from the big gallery in Lewisham High Road Church, London, long years ago.

A. D. Martin.

CHURCH FINANCE—VICTORIAN ERA.

During these days of stringent financial circumstance it is well, occasionally, to try and find a way of escape by thinking of "better days"—if, indeed there ever were "better days". By way of introduction permit the writer to explain his intention by mentioning two typical personal weekly "budgets". Consider the sweet simplicity of his budget at the age of eight years.

	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
To Pocket money ...	½	To Liquorice Everlasting Strips	½

Was ever a statement more perfectly balanced? Did ever the principle of supply and demand meet in more perfect unison? The reader will understand how a lad, particularly of that age, has a singular yet common regard for things which "last a long time".

1 II. 138.

Consider a later one, typical, yet subject to fluctuation according to means.

	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
To Pocket money ...	3 0	To Rowntree's Mixed Gums	6
		Library—Soiled copy of Massingham's *Nation*	1
		Book Fund	1 6
		Forward to next week	11
Total ...	3 0	Total ...	3 0

Some have figures thrust upon them. Lamb speaks of "Six and thirty years since I took my seat at the desk in Mincing Lane". Substitute "nine and twenty" for "six and thirty" and a "Railway Office" for "Mincing Lane", then that quotation would be apt in regard to the writer. Still, to the initiated, ledgers sometime whisper sweet somethings in the ear.

A few years ago for the definite purpose of seeking historical background in regard to Church Finance, I was permitted to scrutinize certain records in a little South Wales mining town the name of which "all the King's horses and all the King's men" will not cause me to divulge. The records ranged from a pocket-sized volume $5\frac{3}{4}'' \times 4'' \times \frac{1}{2}''$ to strongly bound ledgers. Some of them were so dirty and damp that it was positively nauseating to handle them. The reward, however, more than balanced the risks of having a raucous throat and a fearful cold. Well, what did the volumes unfold? Listen. A Pocket volume of 1882 speaks.

	£ s. d.
To General Collection—Public Hall, December 31st, 1882	9 7
Mr. Ll . . d preached	No fee.

This was the first gathering of folk interested in the "forming of a new Church". That Church has flourished until this day. That is an interesting item. But what of the following?

	£ s. d.
To Collection at Bl . . . . . m Service—1883	14 2

That appears to be a very ordinary statement, but that sum was collected on the occasion of a topical sermon being preached because a murder had been perpetrated in the village. Evidently the minister, whilst hot on the trail of a spiritual success, unwittingly or otherwise, scored a monetary one as well.

Do any of my readers remember the old Tea Party? September 9th, 1888. Out of a total of 1,190 persons, 951 presented themselves at a Vestry of 15 x 7 yards. They were duly fed. Note the elaborate and careful preparation—

628 lbs. of Cake.
103 lbs. of Bread.
77 lbs. of Sugar.
19 lbs. of Butter.
8 lbs. of Tea.
Milk ... 10 0
Printing.. 24 6

What a preparation. What a wholesome (one might almost say "wholesale") meal. It happened that the Treasurer was a grocer. Now I am practically certain that that good man noticed amongst those paying guests quite a number whose appetites were in inverse ratio to their seemingly concave forms. Of course, from the point of view of the grocer, that might be quite right. From the standpoint of Church Treasurer, I am sure he doubted the value of such persons as likely to swell the coffers of the Church. Did he not subject that day's affair to a searching analysis? He did—to two decimal places. Let the following delightful and somewhat sweet statistical statement speak:

Consumption of Food per 1s. Ticket sold:

			d.
Cake	10.56 ozs.	cost	2.63
Bread	1.73 ozs.	,,	.11
Sugar	1.3 ozs.	,,	.17
Butter	.32 ozs.	,,	.20
Tea	.13 ozs.	,,	.21
Milk ...	...	...	.12
Printing	...	...	.31
	Total	...	3.75d.

In case those dots worry the reader as indeed they once worried a famous statesman I had better state that 3.75d. = Three pence, three farthings. The profit therefore works out thus:

951 x 8¼d. = Net Gain.

There must have been other guests present whose capacity for food was in inverse ratio to their obvious convex form.

Let me go on.

July 31st, August 1st and 2nd, 1890. Trouble? £1,000 Chapel Debt, "a church composed entirely of working people". Hence, the following effort in the "grand manner"—"A Grand Bazaar", to be held in the Town Hall. Aim? To clear half the debt. The 150-word appeal was undoubtedly drafted out by the Schoolmaster, who acted as one of the Secretaries. That in itself was a noble effort. Result?

Total Receipts	£500 4 11½
Total Expenses	£132 0 7½
Handed to Treasurer ...	£368 4 4

Expenses? Well, just a few items:

	£	s.	d.
To G.M.B. K . . . . sl . . . n, (267 miles away) (for Decorations)	40	0	0
Policeman		10	0
Brass Band		11	0
Town Crier		5	0
Stoker		7	0
Ironmonger	3	2	0
Bill Poster	1	10	8
Mrs. J . . . . s, for Boiling Water		11	0

Receipts? A few:

To Members' donations	135	17	6
Stalls	201	5	1
Pair of Slippers		2	6
Donations	many guineas.		

Thirty-two sources of revenue were tapped. They include:

	£	s.	d.
A. To "Wild Beast Show" (This beast was fed at an average per day of 28 pence)	2	14	8½
B. To "Lung Tester" (A Three days Bazaar. Twenty-six pence? Can it really mean that the person in charge of that somewhat sinister-named instrument alone used it, to test the development of his own lungs as the hours rolled on?) ...		2	2

C. *The Tit-bit.*

To Cloak Room ... ... Seventeen pence. Three days. Seventeen pence. Does it not call to mind Dante's famous line "All hope abandon, ye who enter here"?

D. The one item which appears to have disappointed the promoters is a rather uncommon one, "Group of Ministers".

Cost	£9	5	0
Receipts	£4	17	9
Loss on transaction ...	£4	7	3

Practically a 50% loss. A really bad speculation.

Let us listen to the ledgers speaking down the years:

	£	s.	d.
September, '64: I received for the Minister for one Month	7	6	9
and I paid him	7	0	0
October, '69: On the 17th I bought a gallon of oil and paid		1	0
the following week it cost me		1	4
March, '70: I sold Empty Wine bottles		1	0
March, '70: I brought a new light and the Gas fittings cost	30	19	8
Although a House to House collection of sums ranging from two pence to five shillings only realized ...	15	11	8
October, '71: I paid a Student from Bala, North Wales		1	6
and I paid a Minister		1	0

August, '72 : Anniversary Services?	...143	7	11
August, '73 : Mine reached	...156	7	11
—, 1875 : I made a debt clearance	...100	0	0
—, 1876 : I trebled it	...300	0	0
March, '75 : I bought a Harmonium	... 20	0	0
April, '78 : And I improved it	... 2	14	6
March, '79 : It also cost me	... 1	11	6
1879 : In the very same year it also cost me ...	... 7	15	6

The Chairman interrupted: "Evidently '79, that harmonium resented being continually at the mercy of some one's heavy hands and feet. Why did they delay the major operation for four years?" "Well, Sir", said '79, "It looked all right and that ended the matter. It often happens", said he.

	£	s.	d.
1877 Resumed : I paid for Seven baptismal gowns ...	2	2	1½
'84 : I searched for Preachers		10	0
'90 : I asked an Officer what those strange packets were in the Collecting box. He said "Weekly Collection Envelopes".			
'73 : You have forgotten me. I think I ought to be allowed to say that I paid the Minister ...136	18	5½	
'76 : I also want to say that I paid for 4 Months' Communion Bread		1	0

The closure was moved. The last to speak was 1882. He closed on an epic note. In intense silence, almost uncanny silence, he delivered a statistical poem, written in an uncommon metre yet pregnant with noble thought.

	£	s.	d.
In the year 1882, the Minister died.			
To Burial Board	3	13	0
To Coffin	8	10	0
To Walling Grave	7	16	3
To Blinds and cloth for mourning	8	10	0
To Groceries—day of funeral		18	0
To The Children	10	0	0
To The Children—each month for 3 months	4	0	0

What does that call to mind? Does it not call to mind a noble epic written centuries ago? Does it not fulfil the high ideals of Job's immortal words?

> If I have withheld the poor from their desire, or have caused the eyes of the widow to fail;
>
> Or have eaten my morsel myself alone, and the fatherless hath not eaten thereof;
>
> If I have seen any perish for want of clothing, or any poor without covering;
>
> If I have lifted up my hand against the fatherless, when I saw my help in the gate;
>
> Then let mine arm fall from my shoulder blade, and mine arm be broken from the bone.

CHARLES H. PHILLIPS.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

JOHN WESLEY AS LETTER WRITER.

The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M. Edited by JOHN TELFORD, B.A. Epworth Press. Standard Edition. 8 vols. £7 7s.

John Wesley. By C. E. VULLIAMY. Bles. 10s. 6d.

No better way of approaching Wesley's *Letters* could be found than by reading Mr. Vulliamy's biography. Mr. Vulliamy has not succumbed to the allurements of the Strachey method, but nevertheless he writes interestingly and well. He has provided a summary of Wesley's life which is readable and sympathetic, and his volume will both serve as recapitulation and provide the background for the study of Wesley in the light of his correspondence.

It is not necessary to say much about the work that Mr. Telford has done in the preparation of this Standard Edition of the *Letters*. It will rank with Curnock's edition of the *Journal*, and from the two together we can get an accurate and detailed picture of one of the most remarkable figures of the eighteenth century. The letters begin in 1721, when Wesley was 18, and end only with Wesley's death in 1791, every year being represented save 1722 and 1728. Altogether there are 2,670 letters, compared with the 800 letters of Cicero's we possess, and the 3,060 of Horace Walpole's.

Mr. Telford has performed his stupendous task efficiently and without ostentation. Occasionally there is some duplication in the notes; occasionally we feel we desire a little more information; but there are very few slips (a closing "quote" seems to be missing in IV. 35-6; is "court-marshalled" (III. 178) right?); sometimes there is a suspicion that a letter has been incorrectly copied or Wesley's shorthand incorrectly transcribed, *e.g.*, the end of the letter to his brother Charles (III. 136) does not read like Wesley at all:

> For a wife and a partner you and I may challenge the world together. But love is rot.

But on the whole the editor's work is beyond praise. Even when errors were detected, as in the case of the letter duplicated on VII. 94, and VII. 116, it was found that corrections had been made in the Addenda. There are full indexes and a useful "Chronicle", while the Introduction provides an excellent summary.

The number of letters surviving is sufficient in itself to show that Wesley was "a good correspondent". He not merely kept in touch with a rapidly growing movement, the organization of which he kept in his own hands, but he had a deep sense of responsibility for individual souls, and he bombarded his converts with inquiries about their bodily and spiritual welfare. Just as he insisted that preachers should visit members of the Society from house to house, so he endeavoured to maintain personal contact with as many Methodists as possible. He overlooked no detail in the work of a preacher, the building of a meeting-house, the affairs of a school, or the life of a correspondent; he was, in more senses than one, the leader of the *method*ists, as Mr. Telford well brings out.

Controversy, too, demanded much of his attention, and many of the longer letters were addressed to critics of various kinds—Moravians, Quakers, Roman Catholics, Bishops, Calvinists. What a barrister Wesley

would have made! Few could stand his cross-examination, and the way he riddles those whose attacks on the Methodist Societies were based on hearsay is devastating indeed.

Wesley was under no misapprehension about his gifts as a letter-writer. He had no time for frills of any kind, and his correspondence, like his preaching, was always directed to a definite end—the stilted letters to Mrs. Pendarves are a solitary exception. He knew that "the peculiar talent which God has given me" was "my economy and outward management both of my family and Society"; his genius was indeed an infinite capacity for taking pains. But this emphasis on the practical means that there are no purple patches in his letters; we cannot recollect, looking back on the eight volumes, a single description of scenery that stands out—and this from the man who traversed England more than any of his contemporaries. Perhaps Leslie Stephen's verdict on Wesley as a writer cannot be improved: he

> shows remarkable literary power; but we feel that his writings are means to a direct practical end, rather than valuable in themselves, either in form or substance. It would be difficult to find any letters more direct, forcible, and pithy in expression. He goes straight to the mark, without one superfluous flourish. He writes as a man confined within the narrowest limits of time and space, whose thoughts are so well in hand that he can say everything needful within these limits. The compression gives emphasis, and never causes confusion. The letters, in other words, are the work of one who for more than half a century was accustomed to turn to account every minute of his eighteen working hours.

Alike with tongue and pen Wesley sought simplicity. Telling Samuel Furly to beware of "stiffness", he quotes some lines of Pope, and says (IV. 257):

> Here is style! How clear, how pure, proper, strong! and yet how amazingly easy! This crowns all; no stiffness, no hard words; no *apparent* art, no affectation; all is natural, and therefore consummately beautiful. Go thou and *write* likewise.

Fifteen months before he had written to the same correspondent (IV. 232):

> I doubt you had a dunce for a tutor at Cambridge, and so *set out* wrong. Did he never tell you that, of all men living, a clergyman should "*talk* with the vulgar"? yea, and *write,* imitating the language of the *common people* throughout, so far as consists with purity and *propriety* of speech? *Easiness,* therefore, is the first, second, and third point; and *stiffness, apparent* exactness, *artificialness* of style the main defect to be avoided, next to solecism and impropriety. You *point* wrong, Sammy: you aim at a wrong *mark.* If he was a standard for any one (which I cannot possibly allow), yet Dr. Middleton is no standard for a preacher—no, not for a preacher before the University. His diction is stiff, formal, affected, unnatural. The art glares, and therefore shocks a man of true taste. Always to talk or write like him would be as absurd as always to walk in minuet step. O tread natural, tread easy, only not careless. Do not blunder or shamble into impropriety. If you *will* imitate, imitate Mr. Addison or Dr. Swift. You will then both save trouble and do more good.

Even so with tunes (IV. 311):

> They sing all over Cornwall a tune so full of repetitions and flourishes that it can scarce be sung with devotion. It is to those words,
>
> Praise the Lord, ye blessed ones.
>
> Away with it! Let it be heard no more.
>
> They cannot sing our old common tunes. Teach these everywhere. Take pains herein.

It has often been said that Wesley was very much of a Pope, and there is abundant evidence of this in these volumes. Few men, even in the

eighteenth century, would write to their fathers in the pontifical way in which John did in declining to accept his father's living of Epworth. The letter ends (I. 179):

> These are part of my reasons for choosing to abide . . . in the station wherein God has placed me. As for the flock committed to your care, whom for many years you have diligently fed with the sincere milk of the Word, I trust in God your labour shall not be in vain, either to yourself or them: many of them the great Shepherd has by your hand delivered from the hand of the destroyer; some of whom are already entered into peace, and some remain unto this day. For yourself, I doubt not, but when your warfare is accomplished, when you are made perfect through sufferings, you should come to your grave, not with sorrow, but as a ripe shock of corn, full of years and victories. And He that took care of the poor sheep before you was born will not forget them when you are dead.

In much the same way he treated the rest of his family. Charles, we know, for long suspected him of trying to bring him into subjection, while he seems to have managed his sisters as badly as he managed other women. To one who complained that he had not helped to find her lodgings in fifteen weeks, he replied (II. 13):

> No, nor should I have done in fifteen years. I never once imagined that you expected *me* to do this! Shall I leave the Word of God to serve tables? You should know I have quite other things to mind: temporal things I shall mind less and less.

He ends the same letter:

> You are of all creatures the most unfavourable to God and man. I stand amazed at you. How little have you profited under such means of improvement! Surely, whenever your eyes are opened, whenever you see your own tempers, with the advantages you have enjoyed, you will make no scruple to pronounce yourself (whores and murderers not excepted) the very chief of sinners.

Wesley's autocratic temper is best seen in his dealings with his preachers. While he is willing to listen to representations about changes from one "Round" to another, his decision is final, and his rule, "You are to preach when and where I appoint" had to be obeyed. He utterly refused to allow them to stay for long in one place, saying of two of them (III. 194):

> Be their talents ever so great, they will ere long grow dead themselves, and so will most of those that hear them. I know, were I myself to preach one whole year in one place, I should preach both myself and most of my congregation asleep. Nor can I believe it was ever the will of our Lord that any congregation should have one teacher only. We have found by long and constant experience that a frequent change of teachers is best. This preacher has one talent, that another. No one whom I ever yet knew has all the talents which are needful for beginning, continuing, and perfecting the work of grace in an whole congregation.

He approves or forbids the marriages of the preachers, criticizes their work with great candour, and is always insisting on open-air exercise and early hours. Ten should be the latest hour for retiring, and only six to seven hours should be spent in bed. While he was prepared to allow wide departures from uniformity in some respects, on other points he was very rigid. He refused to attend chapels where the rule about the separation of men from women was not observed, and in 1772 he declared:

> Whoever among us undertakes to baptize a child is *ipso facto* excluded from our Connexion.

Francis Wolfe in 1773 receives this brief, but no doubt sufficient, epistle:

> Franky, are you out of your wits? Why are you not at Bristol?

With all this, he wrote to the preachers with great familiarity—"Dear Sammy", "Dear Tommy", and the like—and he did not stint his praise. Their health was his constant concern, and some of the suggestions of the amateur doctor, who took himself very seriously in this *rôle,* are alarming to read, although others—lemonade was a great specific—could do no harm. Tea-drinking is denounced as both harmful and extravagant, the case against it taking 31 points and occupying 12 printed pages.

It is noteworthy that Wesley wrote to few *men* but his preachers, though there are one or two exceptions like Ebenezer Blackwell. He had, however, a great many *women* correspondents, and his letters to young women are a striking feature. He was so uniformly unfortunate in his personal relationships with women that we cannot help regretting that they were not confined to the epistolary. The reader is recommended to Mr. Vulliamy for accounts of Wesley's love affairs, but these letters give us new details about Sophia Hopkey, Grace Murray, and other women, and throw a lurid light on his marriage. What a time the poor man had! And who shall say how far he deserved it? Certainly there is more than enough in the letters to show how he continually laid himself open to misunderstanding and misrepresentation.

Wesley's practical nature comes out continually, while his views are often expressed in terse, epigrammatic form. The strength of his convictions, his commonsense, and his ability to express his views in crisp phrase, all appear in the following selection.

> In public speaking speak not one word against opinions of any kind. We are not to fight against notions but sins.
>
> I am not careful for what may be an hundred years hence. He who governed the world before I was born shall take care of it likewise when I am dead. My desire is to improve the present moment. And whatever may be the fruits of lay-preaching when you and I are gone to our long home, every serious man has cause to bless God for those he may now see with his eyes, for the saving so many souls from death and hiding a multitude of sins. The instances glare in the face of the sun.
>
> A lifeless unconverting minister is the murderer-general of his parish. He enters not into the kingdom of heaven himself, and those who would enter in he suffers not.
>
> I am well assured I did far more good by preaching three days on my father's tomb than I did by preaching three years in his pulpit.
>
> Mr. Augustus Toplady I know well. But I do not fight with chimney-sweepers.
>
> Methodist preachers cannot have always accommodation fit for gentlemen. But let us look upon David Brainerd, and praise God for what we have . . . The living souls make us ample amends for the inconvenient houses.
>
> It is abundantly easier to lose our love in that rough field [controversy] than to find truth.
>
> The point they aim at is this—to make Calvinists. Our point is to make Christians. They endeavour to convert men to the dear Decrees; we to convert them to God.
>
> One good temper is of more value in the sight of God than a thousand good verses.

Though he deplores humour in religious controversy, thinking that its nature forbids the application of Horace's dictum—

> *Ridentem dicere verum,*
> *Quis vetat ?*

he frequently uses an ironic humour. Thus he begins one long controversial letter :

> Sir,
>
> You put me in mind of an eminent man, who, preaching at St. James's, said, "If you do not repent, you will go to a place I shall not name before this audience".

He suggests that a preacher "may do good to Rowland Hill by being abundantly more popular than him", and that "Mr. Woodhouse will not die yet, unless it be by the help of physicians and surgeons". Of one of his preachers he writes that he

> would willingly travel. But how? Can you help us to an horse that will carry him and his wife ? What a pity we could not procure a camel or an elephant !

There are scores of other points to which we should like to refer. We see the development of Wesley's views in regard to Apostolic Succession, and the strength of his feeling against Quietism and Mysticism. We notice his use of the method of casting lots, and, knowing the weakness of preachers in estimating the size of their congregations, wonder who checked Wesley's five or ten thousand. More important are the suggestions the letters contain which have stood the test of time—about preaching, controversy, religion and business, and many other things. All these must wait another occasion.

Wesley's main bequest to our times was not in the written word, but in the life he lived. "I want to be on the full stretch for God !", is the way he expressed his aspiration. He said that his temptation was to be a "philosophical sluggard", and when he was preaching 800 sermons a year he deplored his indolence and inactivity. "Haste, not hurry", was his motto, and a long letter written towards the end of his life shows how he tried to practise it.

Well may Charterhouse count Wesley as the greatest of its sons and thus commemorate him in its School song :

> Wesley, John Wesley, was one of our company,
> Prophet untiring and fearless of tongue,
> Down the long years he went
> Spending yet never spent,
> Serving his God with a heart ever young.

ALBERT PEEL.

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS.

THROUGH AMERICAN EYES—EUROPE.

Europäische Wirtschaftsunion. von Georg Schulze. O. Stollberg. RM. 2.

Economic Geography of Europe. By W. O. Blanchard and S. S. Visher. McGraw-Hill. 17s. 6d.

Two American scholars, teaching in the Middle Western States of Ohio and Illinois, are the joint writers. By origin one is plainly French, the other German. They write in English, and they belong to the new race, compounded of all the European races, which is yet, according to them, essentially European in ideas and ideals, in thought and in outlook, as well as, almost entirely, in blood. Such are the facts, and such is the teaching, in no uncertain tones, of this very attractive book, in every way an admirable example of the best American scholarship. With endearing, but unnecessary, modesty it is explained that Americans have waited long for an economic geography of Europe to be written by European scholars. Similarly Europe has waited for a corresponding book on N. America by Americans. In 1924 the second gap was filled by Messrs. Jones and Bryan, with their *North America,* now in its second edition. Our present authors thereupon felt emboldened to publish the material which they had been using for class teaching. The result is certainly worthy of the schools inspired by that greatest of all living geographers, Ellsworth Huntington.

To those of us who know how remote and distant Europe is rapidly becoming to the mass of ordinary folks in the Middle Western States, it is a matter for congratulation that such a scholarly volume should appear from the pens, or rather, more probably, the typewriters, of two gentlemen who are the leading geography experts in that great industrial region, a region including numbers of large cities, such as Cleveland, Columbus, and Cincinnati, whose very names, except on imported articles, are quite unknown to the average Englishman or German. It is a significant book in many ways. It is so competent. Beautifully produced, fully supplied with relevant tables of statistics, with graphs, maps, and delightfully revealing photographs—from that of reindeer searching for lichen under the snow to those illustrating how the new force—hydro-electric power—is rapidly "ironing out the energy-curve" in S. Italy. The first American reaction is often realist; the European far too often romantic only. And we need realism, for the Christian faith is out to tackle stern realities in actual life, whatever dainty webs it may spin in the study. As we meet it in the New Testament, it is not a metaphysical theory but the way of joy and sanity. Thus the new geography, which strives to grasp the facts so that we may be able to handle them with effective competence, is distinctly a study for religious people; at any rate for those who, in the words of Messrs. Jones and Bryan's preface, are as "impatient of unrelated inconsequent fact" as we all ought to be. Let us approach and see the world through the eyes of the American scholar concerned to show his countrymen that world as it really is, lest they become Chinese-like in a dangerous mental isolation.

Immediately we are struck by the *reinstatement* of Europe. We have been accustomed to think of ourselves as receding in importance. Not so. Europe, though the smallest of all the continents, is yet still immensely the most significant. Europeans still own three-quarters of the world's

wealth. Other peoples, even in N. America, *accumulate* little. The annual *increment* in Europe is half the world's total. Thus, in spite of vast investments here recently by Americans, Europe remains the one continent whence surplus funds are available for development elsewhere in the world. In 1928 half the world's wheat, coal, horses, and wood-pulp were produced in Europe, and more than one-third of the total of pigs, sheep, paper, and water-power. In general development on modern lines, as that of "white coal"—hydro-electric power—we are well ahead. Moreover, our authors rightly remind us and their own countrymen that the world's civilization in general is essentially European in origin, and has been so for the last 1,000 years. At present 90 per cent of the land on our globe is governed by people of European origin, whilst 70 per cent of the people on it are under their control. Theodore Roosevelt's prediction that in the 20th century the Pacific would be the dominant ocean has neither been, nor is at present likely to be, fulfilled. The Sino-Japanese races as yet show no sign of taking the lead. On the contrary, Oriental peoples are only making progress in the control of physical phenomena, and in raising the general tone of their populations, in so far as they adopt European methods and ideals. The problems of recurrent floods and unpierced mountain barriers are as yet practically untouched in China. The desire of the country of Egypt and the sub-continent of India for self-government is just exactly a proof that these have absorbed European ideas and teaching, however undesignedly the same may have been passed to them. Of Europeans it may still be said that :

> . . . the magic whereby they work their magic, wherefrom their fortunes spring,
> May be—that they teach all peoples their magic, and ask no price in return.

The United States, too, it is plainly declared, still constantly receives much in the form of new ideas as well as of goods from Europe. The best-informed American opinion, then, does not hold or believe that our originating forces are exhausted.

In a recent number of the *Atlantic* there was an account by an American gentleman of his chauffeur's reactions after a series of motor tours through Western Europe. The first time he drove his employer through France and Spain he was irritated by the frontier and language changes, and half amused at, half contemptuous of, the strong local differences. He compared the chain stores and the universal speech of the U.S.A. with European provincial peculiarities, to the disadvantage of the latter. But later, as he grew accustomed to European conditions, he came to admit that in many ways life over here has its points. Old gardens, historic buildings, even the crooked streets, "as the cows come home" as they say of old Boston, began to make their appeal. The varying dishes and costumes first interested then fascinated him. His initial laudable enthusiasm for the efficient solidarity of humanity was supplemented by an awakening realization of the quiet beauty of personality in leisure, and of the unhurried grace of old time haunts. He began to see that truly adult development requires time in order to come to full stature.

We are apt to recall the story of the old Vermont farmer (or, as some tell it, an Englishman) who boarded a train in New York bound for the Pacific coast. Every few hours he kept worrying the black porter, asking whether they were not nearly at San Francisco. On the afternoon of the third day he was assured somewhat impatiently that they were still little more than halfway across, and is said to have exclaimed that he now thought less of Columbus's achievement : he could hardly have missed

such a vast country. In truth, Europe, cut up by its seas, is very much less in area. Being in Rome with a well read and intelligent American friend, I asked him: "In travelling the same distance (London to Rome) in the U.S.A., how far across the continent would you have been? How much farther would you have to go before you got, as it were, to San Francisco?" "To Khartoum", was the answer. In travelling in Europe the constant recurrence of customs and frontier barriers, and of fresh language areas, dismays and disconcerts the American observer. The traveller in the U.S.A. has to go 500 miles West from New York before he gets outside the State of that name. But, thanks to Lincoln and the great statesmen of the Republic, he has no language changes or customs barriers to pass in the whole long journey to the Golden Gate. Americans to-day are intensely interested in European engineering and roadmaking. They tend more and more to visit us as a continent, not to come to *England* alone. Their growing interest at the moment in Virgil and in the Roman administration of Western Europe is also significant. An American friend who was extraordinarily keen about his daughter's study of the *Aeneid* and desirous that while getting the Latin she should understand the spirit and purpose of the poem, was also intensely interested in the remains of Roman aqueducts and bridges and roads which he visited in France and Italy. Elmer Davis, a Greats man and a fine classic, shows the same bent in some of his writing. They themselves are faced with the task of imposing a civilization on a continent, and they feel the parallel. Then, too, there are many modern ties between American groups and France on the one side, Germany on the other. Many American friends assure me that they joined in the war to save *France,* not England. Pershing said, as he set foot on French soil, "Lafayette, we are here!" The love of France is mirrored in Dorothy Canfield's novels as that of Germany is reflected in William James's life. Yet in spite of these diversities there is real unity in N. America. *Civis Americanus sum* has meaning.

Of three continents with mixed populations two—N. America and India —have attained federated union and practically eliminated customs barriers and intestine wars. But they have reached this goal along very different paths. In America Lincoln saw the danger of allowing another Europe to grow up, and sacrificed half a million lives to save the Union. The exception, the Mexican border, is still the fever line. That the danger does not consist in, or necessarily arise from, language differences, is clear from the example of India. There we have created, wishfully or half unconsciously, the federation of a continent in the short space of a century, working *de haut en bas.* It is a wonderful achievement to have eliminated internal wars and tariff barriers, to have established a continental transport system, to have introduced and *stabilized* a universal coinage, over a sub-continent as large as Europe. I still have a silver coin of Ranjit Singh from the Sikh kingdom of the middle of the last century—unmilled and irregular, open to sweating or clipping, easily forged. A contrast.

Yet Europe, with only 460 millions as compared with the three-quarters as large population of India to-day, and a higher type of development, remains armed to the teeth, tariff-ridden by a vast and senseless organization created and maintained expressly in order to hamper and restrict the passage of supplies from where they are superfluous to where they are desperately needed by consumers. Europe does this, Europe, which, according to the most careful enquiry, still has the responsibility of leading the world, a responsibility which she cannot escape, because no other has her qualifications. How has this double condition— of economic leadership and of political ineptitude—"there are no statesmen now, only politicians" we quote from Ramiro de Maeztu—how has this come about?

In the book before us that part of the explanation which can perhaps be geographic is attempted. It is not suggested that this is a complete explanation even of Europe's dominance. But we have certain obvious advantages. Europe is a peninsula made up of peninsulas. In spite of the relief, so broken and irregular, only a relatively small part of the land is unusable; there are many large and small pockets of rich and deep alluvial. Oceanic penetration divides our continent into a number of easily accessible regions, to all of which water erosion of many relatively low hills has given soil. This same oceanic penetration makes for equality of climate, more especially in the area which is the real nest of world-progress, that around the North Sea, S. Britain, N. France, W. Germany, and the Netherlands. The temperate climate both allows and demands constant activity: "mañana!" (do it tomorrow!) is not possible in this area, nor in the dormouse-like hibernation which we find in Russia and Siberia—vividly described to me by a German officer friend who had had to quarter his men in a Russian forest village during the war on the Eastern front. E. Russian extremes of temperature alone in Europe equal those which prevail over nearly the whole of N. America. Thus the variation of temperature between Bergen and Bordeaux is only 3.6° C. Jan. and 5.7° July, but between the equally distant New York and Key West (Flor.) 21.4° and 5.6°. So in the middle of the continents 1.6° Jan. and 2.9° July between Vienna and Stockholm, 16.3° and 5.0° between New Orleans and Chicago, because in Europe relief, as well as ocean penetration, largely counteracts the effects of latitude. Fertility is also assisted here by the openness of the European plain to the westerly rain-winds. The disadvantages of our Southern relief are offset by the Mediterranean, where, our authors explain to their American readers, we have a "Californian" climate.

From the point of view of transport and communication the Andean and Himalayan barriers in America and Asia are far more serious than the Alps. Though the Alpine peaks rise higher than any summit in the U.S.A., yet the highest elevation of the great transalpine railway tunnels is only *half* that of the great railways of America in crossing the Rockies; and the Himalayas still await the engineer. Features of the book are its transport diagrams and isopleth—equally dense—areas of railroad development, soon doubtless to be connected all over our continent with hydro-electric power. For in water-power, the oldest, yet the newest and most intriguing of all, we are far ahead in actual percentage of potential power already put to use, although our net figures are but 13,000,000 H.P. against the 18,000,000 H.P. of N. America; and we may expect to develop very rapidly, since we possess four-fifths as much *potential* water power as that twice-our-size area. If we would but pool our resources! I have always felt that geography was *against* war and tariffs and *for* religion. Hydro-electric power seems to cry aloud for release from artificial barriers. And all *natural* barriers are now no longer insuperable obstacles, but only gallant challenges, to the engineer.

The enormous preponderance of "short hauling" in Europe impresses the American. "Most European railways are somewhat comparable to the suburban railway development around large American cities". In automobile traffic the short distances travelled reflect the small size of political units and the appreciable difficulties presented by frontiers, also the high price of gasoline and our inadequate petroleum resources. This is almost the only natural product *essential* to modern developments where Europe is caught short; even here brains and the doctrine of substitution will help us out; in Germany the chemists are devising substitute fuels; in England

—typically—we use the steam lorry in a parallel attempt. In airplane traffic we are well developed. Germany is a close absolute (not relative) second to the fifteen times as large U.S.A. The Netherlands (after a recent visit, I am inclined to think the freest and most progressive country in Europe) and Belgium surpass Germany relatively. In Britain we make small use of the commercial plane, except for Channel crossings, where the largest air-traffic in the world has grown up. In Germany two years ago I found that air-travelling was nearly as cheap as 1st Class on the rail, £1 from Karlsruhe to Villingen in the Black Forest, halfway to Constance.

Before 1750 the hoe and chisel and their like were the chief metal implements, the flour-mill the only big machine. Since then the age of steel and copper, coal, and oil. Europe digs half the mineral wealth of the world each year, and manufactures nearly all the lignite and shale oil, producing also, with only 17 per cent of the world's coal resources, 50 per cent of the output. She is the world's greatest mining camp. The most important factor in the exploitation of minerals has been and is *the energy and advancement of the European peoples*. In Europe, by contrast with America, the prospector is replaced by the trained geologist or mining engineer. There is less rush for minerals here, less excitement, gambling, drunkenness, connected with their digging. Miners are therefore homogeneous communities as distinguished from the heterogeneous mining populations of the U.S.A. But the harsh sordid features of mining are equally present, with the long periods of idleness and consequent political restlessness. Contrary to popular belief, the moral characteristics of the various groups and the political advancement of their ideas count for far more than fresh discoveries. The areas which had the greatest freedom and prosperity in 1750 are those which have them to-day—Scandinavia, Switzerland, Holland. Minerals have strengthened the strong, not determined the location of civilization or the amount of progress—a point for those who believe that religious enlightenment is the prime factor in human advance.

The agricultural experts notice that the isolated farmsteads of America are replaced in Europe by villages, in which the farmers mostly live. Historians know that the isolated house in England only dates from Tudor times, and Brailsford has pointed out that it becomes rarer as we travel S.E. across Europe. But the village arrangement, though, as Maine shows, a relic of the joint-family, has given us the advantage of having our populations spread more evenly over the land. This aspect of Europe would be affected by any federation or *Zollverein,* though we should not necessarily lose our present distributive advantage thereby. For many marginal areas in Europe are cultivated under artificial and therefore uneconomic stimuli. Finally, if large expenditure for military establishments were reduced and tariff warfare (our authors' words, not mine) abolished, *Europe could support a considerably larger population than at present, with a distinctly higher standard of living*. The virtual abolishment of tariffs would unquestionably lead to the abandonment of the less profitable mines and factories, and the return of much marginal arable land to forest or pasture. Large tracts of good arable country would also be put to other uses than at present.

The salvation of Europe then, which depends, according to Dr. Schulze's book, on the possibility of an arrangement in the first instance between France, Germany, and Italy, will involve economic re-adjustments. Most Germans omit England because they think that we are too involved in colonial commitments of a world-wide nature. Prof. Einstein, on the other hand, told half-a-dozen of us in Oxford this summer that a federation

of England and Germany is essential and inevitable if Europe is to be saved. To meet him and to look into his eyes is to feel that he is one of the great *religious* personalities of the world. A mystic and a prophet. Asked why he was a pacifist, he said not at all by logical convincement—he had been so long before the war. For him pacifism had always been an integral part of his life-faith—as natural and inescapable as breathing. Versailles, says Dr. Schulze, was a Caudine Forks; it did not destroy the strength of Germany, yet left a thirst for revenge. Pacts and conventions, he says, are like the waters of baptism—the water alone without the spirit effects nothing. Such conventions are only of worth in practice as long as the majorities and relations of power which pre-suppose them continue—in which case the same thing would have happened anyhow.

Yet all the same it is so easy to be good Europeans. In crossing the St. Gotthard two years since we had a harmonious quintette in the compartment: an Italian cloth-merchant, a German headmaster, a Swedish oil-traveller, and two English. What a wonderful talk we had in English, German, and Italian alternately—philosophy, religion, education, sociology. Only a week before, coming down from Monreale to Palermo in the tram, the Sicilian young men clapped our two couples, English and German, on the shoulder, and gaily acclaimed our evident friendship. "*Gli italiani ed i tedeschi sono amici*!" they assured our friends, Prof. and Frau W. They asked us about ourselves, and loaded us with twigs of fresh orange blossom.

Can the vested interests learn longsightedness and be willing for the necessary re-adjustments? The multilingual character of Europe at least—India shows it—need be no bar to federation. Nor would the various groups lose their personalities any more than the brothers and sisters in a family do so. Development of personality, either of nations or persons, can only take place as a result of association in the group. Broader sympathies, deeper and more intelligent affection, do not mean loss or dispersion of the personal entity, or a weaker will. Ignorant obstinacy and the maintenance of characteristic superstitions and outworn prejudices do not constitute character or make for greatness of personality in either a man or a group. It is the terror of re-adjustment and the consequent temporary disturbance and loss which holds us back from our salvation—*really*, cowardice. And the religious people's reluctance to apply their faith to economic conditions and realities. Christian faith should carry with it courage and intelligence. Dear *croyants*, be willing to see how all-penetrating your faith should be. Is not religion the life-blood in all the capillaries of our existence? If it cease to flow strong and sweet, if it become infected, we die—as Europe seems now dying, if she be not saved—of blood-poisoning.

J. P. Naish.

SUMMER STUDENTS IN GERMANY.

I. THEOLOGICAL.

In these days, as in all times, travel is considered a very essential part of education, and each summer witnesses a great exodus of young men and women from our country to the Continent to obtain, as far as limited means and time will allow, some idea of the language, customs, and manners peculiar to our Continental neighbours. For example, scholars from some of our schools have exchanged with those from Continental schools; this promises to become very popular and should produce a better understanding between European countries.

A more significant movement, which is only in its infancy, is the exchange of theological and other students from the home Universities with those of the Continent; given the proper Christian support and encouragement, this, too, is bound to promote friendship and to further the interests of peace in the countries concerned. It is interesting to relate that, through the untiring efforts of a German student, Herr Werner Koch, at Bonn University, the first French students since the War will come to Bonn for study this year, and German students will study in France.

This summer a most successful experiment was carried out by the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland. It took the form of a Reading Party, composed of theological students from all parts of the British Isles, who visited the Universities of Bonn and Marburg. The members of the party, 14 in number, were representative of the following Churches: Congregational, Baptist, Wesleyan, Anglican, Church of Ireland, and the Presbyterian Church of Wales.

Our route to Bonn lay through Ostend, Aachen, and Cologne, and, 18 hours after leaving London, we were welcomed at Bonn by Herr Werner Klett, a philological student at the University. He proved to be a very valuable guide and friend, and no small measure of our gratitude was due to him for the wonderful success of our stay. Herr Dr. Stockhausen was in charge of the arrangements at Bonn and Professors Weber and K. L. Schmidt were especially at the disposal of our party.

On Sunday afternoon, 5th July, we had our first experience of the German students, when we were entertained by the *Deutsche Christl. Studentenvereinigung,* an association somewhat similar to our S.C.M. Here we had to introduce ourselves individually, explaining our denomination, College, and University.

During the week the Theological Seminar in the University was placed at our disposal for private study, and here we received lectures in English from some of the Professors. We were also privileged to attend the ordinary classes of Prof. Weber in *N.T.* and of Prof. Holscher in *O.T.,* and at 7 o'clock one morning we attended the class of Prof. Karl Barth.

In our conversations the teaching of Barth was the main theme, and thus we became familiar with many of his views. It was indeed surprising to see the great following that Barth has at Bonn; we were told that over half of the students in Germany are his disciples, and we were fortunate in being able to hear him. Our stay in Bonn was not long enough for us to understand the Barthian Movement. The students are absolutely carried away by it, and it will be interesting to see how this religious movement and the present political crisis in Germany will interact. Over 80% of the German students are Nationalists, but Barth himself is opposed to the Nazi movement. It was a great moment for us when we saw the famous theologian enter the lecture hall, which held, at 7 a.m., over 250 students. Before proceeding with his lecture, which was afterwards translated into English by one of his students, he asked the class to sing a hymn. This was done most enthusiastically; it appears to be the custom before each lecture.

Later we were invited to Barth's home on the banks of the Rhine, and here, in his study, we were with him for over two hours. During this time, we each asked a particular question dealing with some aspect of his teaching. The lecture which we had heard dealt with the Essence and Beauty of the Word of God, and naturally, we desired further enlightenment on a few points. My question dealt with the possibility of the inner light being a source of revelation, and another man asked if the Word of God can be criticized by Higher Criticism and Science. Barth most courteously answered our questions and took a delight in balancing English idealism

against German realism. We felt that we had been greatly privileged in meeting Barth in such a friendly way. On another occasion we listened to a criticism of Dibelius's view of the Church as against that of Barth.

In the Seminar Prof. K. L. Schmidt spoke on the "Framework of the History of Jesus". Prof. Goeters, who was present at tea on the Sunday afternoon, had evidently been impressed by our various denominations, and he gave a lecture in which he gave us some idea of the value to Germany of the different denominations in Britain. This was very interesting, for we had a view put forward which is not favoured by the Barthian school. They hold that the intermingling of denominations must inevitably lead to a confusion in theological organization.

A lecture by Herr Werner Klett, our German leader, on "The Modern German Student", and a visit to the Institute of Phonetics, where Professor Menzerath lectured to us on "Experimental Phonetics", completed our educational programme at the University.

We attended a Bible Study of the *D.C.S.V.* at which a minister spoke on the Kingdom of God, and here we had a very lively debate between the Barthian disciples and our group.

From the very outset, we were deeply impressed by the friendliness of the Germans. They did all they could possibly do to make us happy and they were more than successful. Every opportunity was given us to get an insight into all aspects of the life of the German student.

At Bonn there are 7,700 students, of whom 2,000 belong to the 85 corporations or clubs. Each club has its own headquarters and we were invited to spend an evening at the *Rheinmark,* the club of the theological students (not the *D.C.S.V.*), where some of the Professors, including Barth, fraternized with the students. It was interesting to see the ancient ritual of the club. The leaders were dressed in very picturesque uniforms; later, Barth and his colleagues donned the regalia of the leaders and thus provided much amusement.

One feature of our stay was a visit to Kaiserswerth, near Düsseldorf, where we inspected the Mother House of the Deaconess Movement, founded by Father Fleidner in the early 19th century. This is a most interesting place occupying over 800 acres of grounds on which there are a great orchard and a huge farm. All kinds of rescue-work are carried out, and the girls are trained to grow fruit, to tend farms, and to do laundry. Besides this kind of work, girls are trained to be teachers, governesses, and deaconesses. We were most interested to inspect the rooms which were occupied by Florence Nightingale while she was training there.

In company with some German students we visited the birthplace of Beethoven, where we saw the original MSS. of many of his works.

As the guests of the English Seminar, we were taken on a trip up the Rhine to the Siebengebirge, and this trip was repeated on the last day of our stay in Bonn. This time we were the guests of the *D.C.S.V.* We were present at a students' Festa at the Heisterbach in the Seven Hills, where the German students gave dramatic performances in the open air, played some old German music, and sang some old German songs. Midnight found us sailing back to Bonn and the day provided a most fitting finale to our happy, though brief, stay in Bonn. Sunday found us bidding farewell to our friends, and we made our way to Marburg on the Lahn.

Marburg, or the Pearl of the Lahn Valley, is a great contrast to Bonn, for here every effort is made by the town authorities to preserve its historicity and antiquity. Adolf Wilbrandt spoke of Marburg as the "most charming hill-town we Germans possess", and we can agree with him;

for the picturesque hill-town, with its jagged profile crowned by a lofty Castle, presents a very fascinating panorama.

The University of Marburg was founded in 1527 by Landgrave Phillipus Magnanimus, and is at present attended by 4,000 students, of whom about 700 are in theology. This presents a great contrast to Bonn's 7,700 and only 400 in theology. A noticeable feature about the theological students was the prominence of young women who are training to become assistants to ministers. They preach in prisons and hospitals, and do rescue-work, but are not allowed to preach from the pulpit. With regard to their training, they take practically the same curriculum as the men.

At present, Germany is menaced by atheistic Bolshevism, and it is quite evident that religion is passing through a very critical time. To regain something of its former certainty, it is essential to search after truth and so the necessity of scientific exploration of the religious field arises.

In the cause of vital religion there must be a union of all lands, especially in a place where the onslaught is great and the attack is at its highest, and that place is Germany. Studied from this point of view, religious investigation is an international affair, but there is need for a suitable place to focus it.

Prof. Rudolf Otto, while in India in 1912, conceived a plan by which this need could be supplied. The War and post-War crises postponed the realization of his dream; but in 1927, the 400th anniversary of the founding of the University of Marburg, his scheme received great support and steps were taken to collect material, and the *Religionskundliche Sammlung,* a collection of material for the study of religion, is the gift of the 1927 jubilee. Its founder is Dr. Otto, and further steps are contemplated toward the founding of an *International Institute for the Study of Religions, Research, Comparative Religion, and the Study of Geographical Expansion of Religions.* Scholars from all fields of study, missionaries, ministers, philologists, will find Marburg an ideal centre for their purpose.

Dr. Otto took great pains to explain all the items of interest. He was in his element as he conducted us from room to room. There was Ramanja, the master and patriarch of the personalist Vedanta school—an Indian bronze statue from Madras. In the close vicinity was a statue in iron from Calcutta of the Indian Goddess, Durga, dancing. There, at her feet, her husband, Shiva, lies prostrate to save the world from the wrath of the Goddess. Leaving India, we soon find ourselves in a Spirit-house of the Papuas. Passing on from there we catch a glimpse of China, where we see the Heavenly Master, the first patriarch of Taoism in China. With the magic touch of his fingers he bans a demon who is protecting himself from the burning eyes of the Master. Near the Heavenly Master is a painting of Kwanoyin, the saviour from bodily and spiritual need, especially the protectress of those on the sea; she rides a dragon over the waves, holding a magic herb in her right hand. The tip of a flag-staff bearing the Moslem confession of faith is an original in brass, and was purchased in Constantinople.

Altogether, it was a very interesting forenoon, and we were proud to have the privilege of hearing Dr. Otto outline the scheme of the Institute. The amount of the material has grown so large that the temporary rooms in the Arts Institute are not sufficient, and the present plan is to gain Marburg Castle for the purposes of the Institute.

In company with some of the German students we visited the Castle, and here we were much impressed when we stood in the throne room where conferences took place between Luther and Zwingli, in 1529. The old

castle contains the second largest government archives of Germany, and is one of the most beautiful and well-preserved castles of the country.

From the Castle, we proceeded to visit the Church of Saint Elizabeth, built 1235—1283, the first church building of pure Gothic style in Germany, which contains rich treasures of medieval plastic art and is the mausoleum of St. Elizabeth.

In our lectures we were initiated into the many problems which exist in German Protestantism to-day. Dr. Frick, the Professor of Evangelical Theology at Marburg, gave us a lecture on "The Present Situation of Protestantism in Germany", in which he spoke of the dissolution of the older schools of thought, the dialectic theology, and the tendency toward new groupings. Dr. Frick was in charge of the arrangements and we were extremely fortunate in having his co-operation.

As in Bonn, the Theological Seminar was placed at our disposal, and here we received lectures in English from some of the University Professors. In a lecture on "The Œcumenical Movement in Germany", Prof. Keller explained the purpose and the machinery of the movement. He was very grave when he told us that the Continent will soon be a battle-field between Christianity and Atheism. "Anti-God" activity is widespread, and it is the boast of Atheism that soon the Cathedral at Cologne will be the centre of its propaganda. Prof. Hermelink gave to us the paper that he delivered at the Lausanne Conference on "Post-War Protestantism in Germany", and Prof. Heiler lectured in his home on "Some Aspects of the Catholic Church".

One very delightful feature of German academic life is the "migration system". There are two *Semesters* in each session, and the students, if they desire, take their registration books and students' cards and go to whatever University they like. Thus, one could spend a winter at Berlin, Munich, or Heidelberg, and then go to spend the spring and summer *Semester* at Bonn, Marburg, or Freiburg. I came into contact with students who migrate each semester. These students choose particular masters in special fields, Otto at Marburg, Barth at Bonn, and Brunner at Zurich, whose classrooms, as a consequence, will be filled to overflowing.

It was with real regret in our hearts that we bade our friends good-bye on Friday, 17th July. Part of our journey homewards was made in a state of fasting which was certainly not religious. We had the misfortune to be in Marburg at the time of the financial crisis, and from the Wednesday onwards we were unable to get our English money changed at the Bank. By Friday, the day of our departure, we had spent practically all the German money in our possession, and, from that afternoon to Saturday morning, most of us were without the wherewithal to buy food. At Ostend, on Saturday morning, our fast was ended, as we were able to transact business there with English money.

PETER GORDON.

II. NON-THEOLOGICAL.

To get to Marburg during the *Semester* is possible only for a comparative few, so that the impressions of one student who took the holiday course this summer may be found of some use.

The whole course was divided into three working weeks in Marburg itself, and one week of journeying up the Rhine. This year's special subject for morning lectures was German education, the first week being devoted to general problems—for instance, "The Spirit of German Education"; the second to single problems—for example, "Education in the Family"; and the third to opportunities for visiting Marburg schools of

various types and listening to the lessons. Afternoons were given over to lectures in German language and literature exclusively for foreigners. One was allowed on the first afternoon to decide between the lectures for Beginners and those for *Fortgeschrittene*. I myself chose first a class for "easy conversation", but, on being asked to explain the difference between the medieval idea of capital punishment and the modern, I decided to leave it to hearts bound in triple brass, and chose a lecture at which were read representative works of modern German literature, such as Rudolf Binding's *Unsterblichkeit* and Josef Poenten's *Der Gletcher*. Max Weber's *Wissenschaft als Beruf* was used as a textbook for lectures on German critical prose.

The most valuable experience the course had to give was that of living as a student with so many different nationalities: there were perhaps a hundred and fifty *Teilnehmer* and they represented sixteen countries. I was allotted to the Dr. Carl Duisberghaus, the most beautifully fitted of the hostels, where there were about fifteen of us—Germans, Poles, Roumanians, Dutchmen, a Norwegian, a Frenchman, a Hungarian, a Finn, and two English people. For most evenings concerts, dances, political lectures, and so forth were arranged; at the *Zusammensein der Ausländer* those countries who were represented in adequate numbers sang their own folk songs; the British Empire sent forth a sufficient volume of sound to be heard away up at the castle, and the next morning received the congratulations of the German students who had heard the singing from there. Excursions were arranged for the week-ends, both for short distances like a walk to the Frauenberg ruins, or more ambitious journeys as far as Bad Nauheim.

The University course during these three weeks was in no way theological: the students were there to learn German, and for the most part they *had* to speak German, as it was the only language common to all. But it was, of course, possible to call on such theologians as were at home, and to see the *Religionskundliche Sammlung,* which is eventually to have a room for the English Free Churches.

Only some seventy of those who were in Marburg took part in the student journey. We went by train to Frankfurt, Heidelberg, and Speyer, and then by boat up the Rhine to Düsseldorf, visited such of the famous buildings as we had time for in each of these places, and also included less usual visits to champagne cellars and Krupp's iron works. The nights were spent in the smaller towns, such as Geisenheim and Andernach, either in hotels or *Jugendherbergen,* as our purses or courage permitted. To stay in a German *Jugendherberge* is certainly a memorable experience; some of them have wonderful views over the moonlit Rhine, like that at Burg Stahleck, but one realizes the wisdom of the usual age limit of twenty. Carrying a suitcase up the spiral staircase of the converted round tower at Andernach is too much like climbing the Monument with a sack of coals to be as romantic as the photographs of it appear. But this was as nothing compared with the fortitude required by a *Schulinspektor* from Czechslovakia: through a confusion of luggage when one section of the party left early, he was condemned for a whole day to the excruciating agony of wearing one black and one brown shoe, both for the same foot! However, we managed during this week to see and learn more of the Rhineland than an English person travelling alone could accomplish in thrice the time. In Düsseldorf we sorted out ourselves and our luggage, and, after another day's exploration, partook of a more formal supper than was our wont. All the guests sat in allotted places

and the Professor drank to the representatives of the different countries; an Italian student expressed the thanks of the foreigners. By the next evening we were in fifty different corners of Europe.

HAZEL MEWS.

BOOKS FROM AND ABOUT GERMANS.

The "Theology of Crisis" is "seeking to declare the *Word* of the Bible to the *World*". So says Dr. Emil Brunner, and in five lectures, *The Word and the World* (S.C.M., 4s.), he summarizes the teaching of the Barthian School, the subjects being "The Word of God and Reason", "The Word of Christ and History", "The Word of the Spirit and Psychology", "The Word of the Bible and Science", "The Word of the Church and Society".

The sub-title of Prof. Rudolf Otto's *Religious Essays* (Milford, 7s. 6d.) —"A Supplement to *The Idea of the Holy*"—is rather misleading. The Essays are classified under (I) "Theology", and (II) "Science of Religion". In (I) four Essays deal with the subject of Sin, the fifth with *Ruach,* the sixth with "The Lord's Supper as a Numinous Fact", and the last with "Liturgical Reform". Under (II) we have "How Schleiermacher Rediscovered the *Sensus Numinis",* "The 'Wholly Other' in Religious History and Theology" (perhaps the most important Essay in the volume), and three other Essays. The Appendix reprints articles from *The Review of the Churches* and *The Hibbert Journal.*

Students have reason to be grateful to Dr. W. Tudor Jones for his outline of *Contemporary Thought of Germany* (Williams & Norgate, 2 vols., 5s. each). The first volume deals, in the main, with the foundation thinkers —Kant and Hegel; the second, in the main, with 20th century writers. The two volumes together make a handy reference book, the usefulness of which would have been improved had Dr. Tudor Jones added a list of names and dates. But we ought not to grumble when he has given us so much.

In *Men, Myths, and Movements in German Literature* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.), Mr. William Rose has done for literature, though less systematically, something of what Dr. Tudor Jones has done for German philosophy and theology. The subjects of the ten papers here collected range from "The Medieval Beast Epic" to "German Drama, 1914-1927" and "The Spirit of Revolt in German Literature from 1914 to 1930". Two papers deal with Goethe, and there is a sketch of Baron Munchausen.

On 22nd March next it will be 100 years since Goethe died, and Mr. H. W. Nevinson, in *Goethe : Man and Poet* (Nisbet, 10s. 6d.) has given us what he calls a "rapid summary of one among the most remarkable personalities in history". When the pace was so rapid it is surprising that Mr. Nevinson stayed so long over the two Parts of *Faust,* but that is perhaps the only criticism of the sketch that can be offered. Mr. Nevinson's study of "the Great Pagan" is crisp and concise, but sympathetic and revealing. Goethe was as strange a mixture as any mortal who has ever walked this earth. Perhaps two of his own sentences provide clues to his character :

> To grow tolerant you have only to grow old. I have seen no sin committed which I might not have committed too.
>
> Dirt is brilliant if the sun shines on it.

EDITOR.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—Francis Bacon.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—John Milton.

(*The place of publication is London, and the date* 1931 *unless otherwise stated*).

Joshua-Judges. By John Garstang. Constable. 20s.

This is a difficult book to estimate adequately in a few words. It has attracted—as was but just—a great deal of attention, and has received full and appreciative notices. Prof. Garstang is so well known, both as a field archæologist of distinction and as a museum director, that such a considerable volume as this from his pen, laborious, detailed, documented, and amply furnished with beautifully executed maps and photographs, was assured beforehand of eager perusal.

The earlier narratives in *Joshua* and *Judges,* namely, those passages marked as JE by the general consensus of scholarship, are here compared with the *extra*-biblical evidence from Egyptian and other sources, and applied to the geography of the country. The author assumes that Joshua was a historical figure of the early 14th century B.C., an account of whose campaigns has come down to us substantially as they occurred. He suggests, apparently with conviction, that even the exact age of the hero at various periods may have been handed down correctly. Joshua was 80 when he entered Canaan, and 110 when he died. His achievements as a military leader were therefore carried out between the ages of 80 and 90! In Prof. Garstang's words:

> These figures, based on the later tradition D, agree, as we have seen, with the general indications of the earlier sources.

The book contains an immense mass of fascinating and valuable geographical and archæological material (naturally not all quite new). The author has himself ridden repeatedly over the routes described, and his work has an especial interest as that of the excavator of the mound of el-Kadeh, which he has identified with the biblical Hazor. But to the present reviewer the main thesis—the reinstatement of the JE strand as a historical document of detailed accuracy—remains unproven. The value of the book lies, I think, in its collected material rather than in its deductions. And for this reason. The JE sources cannot be traced back farther than 850-750 B.C. at the extreme earliest—Prof. Kennett thinks not much earlier than 650 in their present form. Both are plainly politico-religious *Tendenzschriften.* To the experienced student of the Hexateuch it becomes daily more evident that if such fragments as the poems embedded in *Num.* 21, or as *Judg.* 5, are nearly contemporary with the events they describe (and their general appearance makes this not impossible), then the easily running connected narratives on which Prof. Garstang relies have, on the contrary, every mark of being of a very different kind, patriotic epics glorifying the past from the standpoint of accomplishment centuries later; religious sagas reminding the faithful of Ya'u's great deeds in the long ago, by which His mighty power had been proven before the eyes of the heathen through the deliverance and victories of His people.

That the reputed tomb of Joshua was a favourite pilgrimage shrine during the pre-Exile is a justifiable deduction from *Judg.* 2^{9}, where, by the way, the site is identified with an *uralt* seat of sun-worship (*cf. Josh.* $10^{12\text{-}13}$). We know definitely that the *Chanson de Roland* was composed by troubadours on the pilgrim way to Sant Jago de Compostella under the influence of religio-patriotic anti-Saracen enthusiasm, and is at least four centuries younger than the events which it embellishes. We may suspect analogous origins for the *Joshua* narratives, detailed accounts of heroic deeds and successful campaigns, written by people who knew the country well, and coming to us from a period when the Hebrews were struggling anew against foreign influences.

The difference between our use of the Hexateuch narratives and Prof. Garstang's is far from consisting merely in the respective deductions drawn. It is a fundamentally differing estimate of the real nature of the sources. The *Aeneid* is not a historical witness for the early Roman period in the sense in which *Tacitus* and *Suetonius* are so for the time of the Flavians. The *Iliad* cannot be used in the same way as that in which we properly employ *Thucydides*. The same distinction is to be drawn between the type of evidence to be derived from the JE *Joshua* narratives and that furnished by contemporary archives such as the T.A. tablets or the XVIIIth Dynasty inscriptions at Karnak. That there is *some* traditional material behind the JE strands is obvious. It does not in the least follow that they ought to be used as detailed circumstantial evidence of facts, and the attempt to do this would seem to imply some misconception of the real critical position. It is right to make this plain whilst at the same time expressing our gratitude for the valuable information here assembled in such a pleasing and readable form.

J. P. Naish.

Digging up Biblical History. Vol. II. By J. Garrow Duncan, B.D. 12s. 6d.

This second volume contains the remainder of the material accumulated by the author for his Croall Lectures. The first used selected archæological evidence to illustrate the various periods of Palestinian history, arranged chronologically, up to the Roman occupation. The material here is presented under five headings: domestic architecture; religion; inscriptions; burial customs; stone and metal work. Not all of it is new to those acquainted with the standard books on the subject, as those of Gressmann and Benzinger, but none the less we are grateful for this timely publication of the relevant evidence, with such excellent drawings and photographs in illustration. Mr. Duncan's own discoveries on the Ophel are included, with a facsimile of the Ophel *ostrakon*. The impression gained from museum collections, like the set of Astarte figurines, and the case of sealings, in the Ashmolean, is here further confirmed. The evidence regarding the pre-Exilic period transmitted to us in the *O.T.* has been very largely edited and recoloured by those who handed it on during the post-Exile. The bulk of the population before 500 B.C. recognized no obligation either to practise monotheism or to abstain from image or animal worship. The presence of an Astarte temple at Mispah between 900 and 700 B.C. alone goes some way to suggest this.

J. P. Naish.

The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation. By W. F. Howard, M.A., D.D. Epworth Press. 7s. 6d.

His Testimony is True. By A. H. A. Simcox, B.A. Murray. 3s. 6d.

The Historic Jesus in the New Testament. By R. H. Strachan, D.D. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

Jesus of Galilee. By F. Warburton Lewis, M.A. Nicholson & Watson. 6s.

Dr. W. F. Howard's "Fernley Lecture" on the Fourth Gospel is an excellent piece of work, which will be of great value to students for years to come. Its first part gives a complete and lucid summary of all important contributions made to the problem of the Gospel since 1901. Part II contains four critical studies: (i), on the documentary unity of the Gospel and its relation to the other Johannine writings; (ii), on the textual displacements and the chronology of the story; (iii), on the historicity of the Gospel and its relation to the Synoptics; and (iv), on the background of its thought. The third part discusses various problems of interpretation. The appendixes are studies on various special points (linguistic style, use of numbers, *etc.*), and include two full summaries of the displacement- and partition-theories.

Space does not permit even the barest conspectus of the author's conclusions. Their general trend is in the direction of a high estimate of the historical value of the Gospel, but stops well short of any attempt to claim for it definitely apostolic authorship and eye-witness authority throughout. On account of the total lack of unanimity among partition-theorists, Dr. Howard is disposed to distrust altogether the theory of multiple authorship. One interesting feature of this study is the full consideration given to the question whether a number of the briefer and pithier utterances ascribed to Jesus in the Gospel may not be historically true sayings. On a point of detail, why does Dr. Howard assume, as writers nearly always do, that the centurion of Kapharnaum is meant to be a *Roman* officer (p. 147)? Is it because he is called a centurion and was clearly a Gentile? But Antipas must have had centurions in his army, and some of them may well have been Gentiles.

Mr. Simcox's book is a flight of fancy on the part of one who has retired from the Indian Civil Service. He describes how Mary Magdalene came in old age to Ephesus, and was there told by the Apostle John how he had written the Fourth Gospel. Virtually the whole of the Gospel is printed in the course of the story—in the *A.V.*, with its double columns, verse-divisions, and uncorrected transpositions and textual errors, all complete. Two or three Greek words appear, in colossal uncials—to astonish the natives, as it were; but one, alas! contains a grave misprint (p. 30). The book is totally innocent of all attempt to be historically accurate, and abounds in fictitious details. If you doubt whether John the Apostle wrote the Fourth Gospel, consult Westcott! At one point the teaching borders on the pernicious. John says to Mary about Judas (p. 79):

> Blame him not overmuch, Miriam. As Caiaphas was appointed, and Annas, and Herod, and Pontius Pilate, even so to Judas was allotted his miserable task. Be thankful that that task came not to me nor thee.

Honestly, I cannot but regard the composition and perusal of such works, which lead us away from historical reality, and no nearer to religious truth, as a waste of time.

Dr. Strachan's beautifully printed and beautifully bound volume will be found useful by those who welcome the "Sharp Turn to the Right" in Congregational theology, supposed to have been inaugurated last October at Manchester. The general thesis of the book is as follows. An important element in Paul's work was to free the Church's Christology from the purely human and Jewish context that conditioned Jesus' earthly life, and

to demonstrate (by concentrating on His pre-existence, passion, resurrection, and exaltation) the Divine and cosmic significance of His Person. This was a very needful work, and was well done; but it was attended by the danger of undervaluing the historical facts about the humanity of Jesus, and so opening the door to Doketism and other unhealthy forms of Gnosis. The corrective was supplied by the Synoptists, who reflect the Church's sense that the earthly facts were more important than Paul's treatment had suggested. Their somewhat over-historical correction was itself corrected by the author of *Hebrews,* who, accepting the transcendental Christology of Paul, laid stress also on the humanity and even the humiliation of Jesus. The coping-stone was supplied by the Fourth Evangelist, who re-wrote the story of the Lord's earthly ministry from the point of view of the Logos-doctrine—itself the logical conclusion of the Pauline view. By "the historic Jesus" Dr. Strachan means Jesus in His earthly ministry : "the historical Jesus" is He "whose living personality is felt in all history since His coming" (p. 104).

I have space only for the briefest allusion to a few points on which criticism seems called for. I feel that the author, in the interests of his very suggestive theory, tends unconsciously to overestimate Paul's neglect of Jesus' humanity, and still more to underestimate the difference between the Johannine and Synoptic portraits. It is surely misleading to say that "only once does Paul quote words of Jesus" (p. 120 : but see *Acts* 20^{35}; 1 *Cor.* 7^{10}, 9^{14}, 11^{24f}, [?] 1 *Thess.* 4^{15}). The author states that Jesus "knew no more sacred task than to point men to his own person" (p. 111), and that "The modern liberal conception of Jesus as the Teacher is a pure abstraction, with no historical basis, if the Gospels are history at all" (pp. 199f). One would hardly expect to find, if these assertions were accurate, that Jesus is referred to as "teacher" nearly forty times in the Synoptics, and as "teaching" nearly forty times; and that a very large proportion of the reported specimens of His teaching contain no direct allusion whatever to Himself. I observe also that Dr. Strachan does not consider the possibility that by "Son of Man" Jesus may have meant Himself plus the Messianic community (as suggested by *Dan.* 7^{27}), but takes it for granted that He used it as a purely personal title. Furthermore, he seems to reject the usual view that in the Fourth Gospel the Synoptic eschatology has been quietly replaced by a more spiritual doctrine. He thinks the Johannist shared the Parousia-hope of the Synoptists and of Paul. But the passages he quotes in support of his view are all drawn, not from the Gospel, but from the First Epistle, which probably stands closer than the Gospel does to Apostolic authorship (see pp. 174-6, 219f). That the Evangelist wished to correct the increasingly doubtful programme till then usually accepted in the Church is surely obvious. Dr. Strachan passes very lightly over the important question as to how far the *doctrines* built in the first century on Christian "experience" are objectively and eternally valid; let the reader study the way in which the validity of the Johannine doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus is defended on pp. 203-205. It must be remembered that all Christians of that century (including according to our author even the Fourth Evangelist) unquestioningly accepted the quite erroneous view that Jesus would visibly return to earth in triumph in their own generation. They doubtless felt that the Parousia was integral to their "experience" of His Lordship : but in this they were, as we see, mistaken. Nor does Dr. Strachan seem to regard it as in any way a loss that the *facts* in regard to Jesus' discourses and Messianic claim were so totally misrepresented in the Fourth Gospel as we see them to have been. At the bottom of p. 219, *John* 17^3 is misquoted.

The Rev. F. Warburton Lewis is a Wesleyan minister who has published valuable contributions to *N.T.* study, chiefly in connexion with the problem of the misplacement of paragraphs in the Fourth Gospel. This book, which evidently crystallizes the conclusions of many years of thought, is a sketch of the life of Jesus, written with originality and insight and in a dramatic phraseology which here and there recalls the style of Glover's *Jesus of History*. In my judgment, the rhetorical element is a little overdone. The perpetual use of "it were" instead of "it would be" somewhat palls; and one gets the impression now and then that there is some rather unnatural straining after effect. The contents, however, are readable and suggestive; and fresh sidelights are continually thrown on our Lord's ministry. Some of the theories broached are indeed more daring than demonstrable, *e.g.*, the view that the so-called "Parable of the Good Samaritan" was really a piece of autobiography, Jesus Himself being the man who fell among thieves, and the thieves having been set on by the hierarchy; or again, the identification of Lazarus with the rich young ruler. Mr. Lewis furnishes his story with a precise chronology; but the date he gives for the Passion, 29 A.D., is ruled out by astronomical considerations, it being certain that neither Nisan 14 nor Nisan 15 fell on a Friday in that year. Nor can I approve of his rejection of the words in *Mark* 1^{14}, "after that John was delivered up"; this proceeding strikes me as unnecessary and arbitrary. My main criticism of the book as a portrait of Jesus would be that Jesus' "plan" is not brought out concretely enough. There are numerous allusions to the way and the will and the love of God, and so forth, but no clear indication as to what Jesus hoped to persuade Israel to do. Nor is sufficient emphasis laid on the non-military character of the Kingdom of Jesus, as distinguished from the Messianic Kingdom currently expected: for it was stark bloodshed (rather than so vague a thing as "worldliness" or "politics", or "carnal" methods) which was in mind when Jesus made His "great refusal" on the Mount of Temptation. None the less, the book contains many golden passages; one of which (on pp. 37f) is worth transcribing as a specimen:

> He came to establish the kingdom of God, and he chose this curious way of preaching; he came into Galilee preaching. We are so accustomed to it that it is difficult to be surprised at it—but that was his method; it is the method of Christ still, and some are condemned to its practice. There is no other way that God will allow but the slow appeal of God to the mind of man; . . . . . Preaching—no coercion, no intolerance, no force, no legions of angels, no inquisition. Preaching—no dazzling, magic, miraculous demonstrations; no short cuts, no leaping from temple roofs. Preaching. God, having spoken to our fathers in old times in various ways, has gone on to speak in these last days—refusing to change His method—has gone on to speak to us in His Son; and there is Jesus.

C. J. Cadoux.

The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. By Albert Schweitzer. Translated by William Montgomery. Black. 21s.

This massive book is a completion of Dr. Schweitzer's book on Paul published in 1911 which appeared in English in 1912 with the title *Paul and His Interpreters*. In his earlier book, Dr. Schweitzer sought to show the failure of all modern interpreters of Paul and in the final chapter outlined what seemed to him the only true approach to Paul's teaching. Everything in Paul's system—his mysticism, his universalism, his sacramentalism—is "based on the most primitive eschatological premisses".

It is this thesis which this book develops. Though completed during his last visit to Europe and published in Germany only last year, the theory

which this book expounds thus "dates" from 1911. The preface of the book was written "On the Ogowe steamer on the way to Lambaréné". But it is the work, not of Schweitzer the missionary, but of Schweitzer the theologian, and is marked by that "ruthless logic" which he regards as a characteristic of the mysticism of St. Paul.

"Mysticism" has so many meanings that no competent writer will use the word without defining it. Schweitzer describes mysticism as the transcendence of "the division between earthly and super-earthly, temporal and eternal", so that a man may feel himself "while still externally amid the earthly and temporal, to belong to the super-earthly and eternal". In this sense Paul was certainly a "mystic". But if this be mysticism, are not all Christians whose faith is living "mystics"?

Schweitzer regards Paul's mysticism as exclusively a Christ-mysticism. Paul could not have said, "In Him we live and move and have our being" (*Acts* 17[28]). For proof that the Areopagus speech is not Paul's, he refers us to Eduard Norden's *Agnostos Theos* and seems not to know, or to have overlooked, what Meyer tells us (*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums,* III. 92) that Norden has since admitted in conversation that Luke may rightly have given the content of Paul's speech. Schweitzer speaks, indeed, of Paul recognizing a "God-mysticism",

> but it is not in being contemporaneously with the Christ-mysticism . . . They are chronologically successive, Christ-mysticism holding the field until God-mysticism becomes possible,

when Christ, having overcome all enemies, gives "back His now unneeded power to God".

This mysticism of Paul is to be derived, not from pagan cults, but from the eschatological expectation. Behind the expectation there stands the conception of Redemption

> that Jesus Christ has made an end of the natural world, and is bringing in the Messianic Kingdom. It is thus cosmologically conceived . . . The redemption which the believer experiences is therefore not a mere transaction arranged between himself, God and Christ, but a world event in which he has a share.

This eschatological conception of redemption Schweitzer seeks to derive from the teaching of Jesus along the lines laid down in his *Quest of the Historical Jesus.* Yet Paul's eschatology was not simply that of Jesus. Jesus had believed that

> in the final Tribulation the Elect are in God's hands and are assured of partaking in the Kingdom, whether they live or die.

Paul had been taught to distinguish

> between two blessednesses—the Messianic and the Eternal. The Elect of the last generation are the participants in both; those who died earlier can obtain only the eternal, which begins after the conclusion of the Messianic Kingdom. During the Messianic Kingdom they are still dead.

This view created for Paul "the problem of the fate of those who had died in faith in the Messiahship". It is as an answer to this problem, that Paul asserts "the mystical doctrine of the dying and rising again with Christ".

> In consequence of his eschatological view of redemption Paul is obliged to maintain that the powers of death and resurrection which were made manifest in Jesus, are at work among the corporeity of those who are elect to the Messianic Kingdom and render them capable of assuming the resurrection mode of existence before the general resurrection of the dead takes place.

Schweitzer seeks to prove that Christ-mysticism was taught, not by Paul only but by Jesus, but with this difference: Jesus "teaches Christ-mysticism in ways appropriate for the time in which the coming Messiah was walking unknown, in earthly form, upon the earth". Paul "teaches Christ-mysticism in the way appropriate to the time immediately following on the death and resurrection of Jesus".

Pauline mysticism means "an actual physical union between Christ and the Elect". "Every manifestation of the life of the baptized man is conditioned by his being in Christ".

So Schweitzer claims that those are totally wrong

> who refuse to admit that Paul was a logical thinker, and proclaim as the highest outcome of their wisdom the discovery that he has no system. For he is a logical thinker and his mysticism is a complete system . . . Pauline mysticism is an admirably simple thing, so long as it is set in the framework of eschatology, but becomes a hopeless tangle as soon as it is cut loose from this.

It remains briefly to show how Schweitzer relates this apocalyptic mysticism to Paul's missionary zeal, his teaching about the Law, his sacramentalism and his ethics.

Paul's preaching to the Gentiles sprang from his belief that

> the End will come when the number has been completed of those who, by believing in Jesus, make actual their election to the Messianic Kingdom . . . From the fact that Paul's preaching to the Gentiles is based on his universalistic eschatological expectation results its peculiar character. It is directed to Gentiles who are called as Gentiles . . . [Hence] it is not open to him to depart from the position that they have been called to the being-in-Christ as Gentiles, not as Gentiles who have been made into Jews.

On this account he could not suffer Gentile Christianity "to become partaker in the blessing of the Law and circumcision". It is true that side by side with "the quasi-physical redemption doctrine" of Paul's mysticism there is his doctrine of righteousness by faith, but this doctrine is only of subsidiary importance, and is introduced

> to enable him, on the basis of the traditional conception of the atoning death of Christ, to conduct his controversy with the Law by means of the argument from Scripture.

Schweitzer assigns to Paul a realistic conception of Sacraments, and this, too, he explains by eschatological mysticism.

> The forgiveness of sins is for Paul effected in baptism because, through the dying and rising again which takes place in it, the fleshly body and the sin which cleaves to it are abolished, and henceforth are as though they were not.

Baptism is "the beginning of a process which will end with the coming of the Messianic glory". Whereas for Primitive Christian belief,

> partaking of the Lord's Meal establishes table-fellowship with the future Christ . . . Paul, in accordance with his mystical doctrine of the being-in-Christ, represents it as bringing about also that union which is to be experienced now in the present with the mystical body of Christ, a union which alone makes possible the future uniting with Christ at the Messianic feast.

Sacraments

> are necessary only for the men of the last generation who desire to make real their election to participation in the Messianic Kingdom . . . Simply to attain to resurrection at the general resurrection of the dead and to enter into eternal blessedness, sacraments are not necessary. This blessedness is obtained through election in itself and through the "walk well pleasing unto God" which attests it.

Schweitzer sees "the test case for the right understanding of the Pauline sacraments" in

> the explanation of the enigmatic baptism for the dead (1 *Cor.* 15^{29}) . . . Christian baptism has to do only with participation in the Messianic glory by means of the resurrection . . . "The baptism for the dead" answers to a need which could only arise out of the eschatological expectations of primitive Christianity, and is only explicable on the basis of the quasi-physical conception of the being-in-Christ.

The ethic of Paul is likewise explained by his mysticism.

> Paul does not derive his ethic by tradition from Jesus, but develops it solely from the character of the new state of existence which results from the dying and rising again with Christ and the bestowal of the Spirit.

Thus Paul's whole teaching is reduced to a system—a system which owes nothing to Hellenistic or Græco-Oriental influences. The Hellenization of Christianity Schweitzer assigns to Ignatius, and to Justin and the *Gospel of John,* for these

> carry forward the work of Ignatius by inserting the Hellenistic union-with-Christ mysticism into the doctrine of Jesus Christ as the organ of the Logos.

We have tried to express as clearly as space allows the argument of this stimulating work. It is an argument we find unconvincing. In his recent book Canon Raven describes Schweitzer's theory as outlined in his *Paul and His Interpreters* as "an instance of perverse ingenuity necessitated by a false starting-point". With that judgment we agree. The extreme eschatological interpretation, whether of Jesus or of Paul, seems to arise from a confusion of form with content. The "eschatologists", of whom in this country Schweitzer is the best known, have shown that the form of our Lord's teaching is eschatological. But apart from some distinguished scholars, notably at Cambridge, very few believe that Jesus at the sending out of the disciples recorded in *Matt.* 10 expected that before their return the Son of Man would come, and, in His disappointment, went up to Jerusalem to bring about the coming of the Kingdom by forcing His death. And in the interpretation of Paul, Schweitzer's book will do good service in bringing into prominence the "eschatological dualism" of Paul's thought, the apocalyptic contrast between "this age" and "the age to come" which provides the form of his teaching. But it is impossible to explain the rich content of Paul's thought by apocalyptic expectations. Paul is to be understood primarily as a missionary, and his missionary zeal had its source, not in predestinarian phantasies derived from Jewish apocalypse, but in the Good News he was driven to proclaim —the Good News of God known now as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the God Who had sent His Son for men's salvation.

It is significant that although Schweitzer has much to say about Paul's obscure and casual reference to "baptizing the dead", he makes little or no reference to a verse so expressive of Paul's distinctive greatness as 2 *Cor.* 4^{6}. An interpretation which thus ignores Paul's discovery of God's glory in the face of Jesus Christ is an interpretation which has missed the decisive element of Paul's experience and thought.

SYDNEY CAVE.

Kabīr and his Followers. By F. E. KEAY, D.Litt. Oxford Press. 5s.

This book appears in "The Religious Life of India" Series, of which we have already reviewed several volumes in the *Congregational Quarterly.* Written in the first instance for Indian readers, it is of value to all students

of Indian religion. Tradition asserts that Kabīr was born of Muslim stock, though brought up in a Hindu family of the weaver caste. However that may be, there may be discerned in his teaching the influence of Islamic monotheism on Hindu ideas. His followers, the members of the Kabīr Panth, number nearly a million, whilst he is recognized as one of the Gurus of the Sikhs and some of his verses have their place in the *Adi-Granth,* the Sacred Scripture of the Sikhs. The *Adi-Granth* has been translated into English by Macauliffe, but the six volumes of his *Sikh Religion* are expensive to buy, whilst Dr. Rabindranath Tagore's beautiful *Poems of Kabīr* cannot, we are informed, be used for the serious study of Kabīr's beliefs. In this concise and well-illustrated volume, Dr. Keay provides us with a most interesting account of the life and teaching of this sixteenth century Indian saint, and an authoritative description of the doctrines and practices of his modern followers. Missionaries are often accused of intolerance. Books such as this are a proof of the wise and discriminating sympathy with which they study the beliefs of those among whom they work.

SYDNEY CAVE.

Buddha und Christus. By H. W. SCHOMERUS, D.Th. Halle. RM. 3.50.

Gandhi, Christus und wir Christen. By WALTER GABRIEL. Halle. RM. 3.60.

It is not surprising that Indian thought should have a special fascination for the land of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann, or that in these troubled times some in Germany should look to Buddha for the satisfaction of their religious needs whilst others see in Mr. Gandhi a second Christ, the Saviour of our modern world.

It is with this in mind that these books have been written. They are published in connexion with the Orphanage at Halle founded by Francke. From the Halle of Francke's days came some of the greatest pioneers of Protestant Missions in India. These men were missionaries, not because they knew of Hinduism, but because of their experience of God's grace in Christ. The books before us are written by scholars who know well the phases of Indian thought with which they deal, but that knowledge has not lessened their authors' missionary zeal.

Dr. Schomerus was, if we mistake not, once a missionary in India, and is well-known to students of Hinduism by his great book, *Der Saiva Siddhānta,* and this short and popular book, *Buddha und Christus,* is written with a scholar's precision. He portrays the life and teaching of the Buddha as given in those Pāli texts which speak of him merely as a human teacher and then expounds in contrast the life and teaching of our Lord. Brief as is the book it brings out with admirable lucidity the fundamental difference between the message of the Buddha and of Christ, and between the way of self-redemption which Buddha taught and the Christian salvation mediated to us through Christ's Cross.

We have read with special interest *Gandhi, Christ, and We Christians.* It is written with competent knowledge, with scrupulous fairness, and with great admiration for Mahatma Gandhi's character and spiritual power. The writer realizes to the full the rebuke which Mr. Gandhi's emphasis on some phases of our Lord's teaching is to us Christians who ignore them as too difficult. But he shows the absurdity of speaking of Mr. Gandhi as "the most Christlike Christian" of our time. Good and noble man he is, but not a Christian. The background of his thought is Hindu, even although his ethics are in part Christianized. As this writer puts it, Hinduism is not so much a "pantheism" as a "theopanism", for it asserts

not that all is God but that God is all. And this "theopanism" is far removed from Christian theism. It makes the world and its activities *maya*, gives to asceticism an exaggerated value, and interprets salvation in a negative sense.

> If Christianity were only a teaching of love to our neighbours and our enemies, if Jesus Christ were not the only begotten Son of the Father, full of grace and truth, Who died for us and as victor over death rose again, then would we have no Gospel to bring to Gandhi, the prophet of self-sacrificing love. Instead, we might have to learn from him.

If that be not so, it is

> not because we are better men than Gandhi, but only because we have the Bible and in it the living God as Creator, and Jesus, the Son of God as Saviour.

And the book concludes with the appeal that we should ourselves, remembering Mr. Gandhi's criticism of us, become better Christians "lest God's name be blasphemed through us".

SYDNEY CAVE.

Christus Victor, An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of the Atonement. By GUSTAF AULEN. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Sin, Suffering, and God. By A. P. SHEPHERD, M.A., D.D. Hodder. 6s.

The thesis of the first book, the work of a distinguished Swedish theologian, is that the modern discussion of the Atonement has issued in a ding-dong battle between the "objective" satisfaction-theory and the "subjective" doctrine which sees in the Atonement the revelation of God's love to the sinner.

Professor Aulen intervenes in this continual and, as he thinks, ineffectual warfare, with the reminder that there is yet a third type of theory. This is the patristic theory, which he calls by the question-begging name of "classical". The theory was displaced by the satisfaction-theory during the Middle Ages, when also we have the beginnings of the "subjective" theory with Abelard. Luther revived the patristic theory, but it was instantly dropped by his successors.

The "classical" theory, as it is developed by the Fathers of the Church, is that Christ through the Incarnation, the Cross, and the Resurrection breaks the power of Death, Sin, and the Devil. Luther adds to the list of defeated enemies also the Law and the Wrath of God.

A *N.T.* basis for the theory is found in the Gospel references to Christ's victory over Satan, and above all in the doctrine of the Apostle Paul as it is expounded in Wrede's *Paulus*.

Professor Aulen rebuts the modernist view that the patristic doctrine is "mythological". He holds that, on the contrary, it reveals a healthy realism: the victory of Christ over the opposing powers means that the world is *really* reconciled to God.

The reviewer cannot believe that any settlement of the "objective-subjective" debate about the Atonement is likely to come from going back to the patristic view. It is quite true that it has a basis in the *N.T.*, but so also have the other theories. The same is the case with Luther—all three theories are to be found in his works.

If we recognize that all the theories correspond to something in Christian experience, the fundamental problem is to find the central point of view, whence the different elements of experience can be seen in their true proportions.

That central point of view must be found in the revelation of the Divine love in the Cross. The worth of the satisfaction-theory is that it emphasizes the element of cost in the Atonement. The patristic theory can only be of value if the victory of Christ over the opposing powers is treated not as something dramatically staged for our contemplation, but as a conquest really and truly won in our hearts. The return upon the patristic theory may have one good effect. It may remind us that the current way of speaking of the revelation of God's redeeming love in Christ as something "subjective" is altogether unfounded. Christ, His Cross, the love of God, are all *objective*. It took all the objectivity of our Lord's Passion and Death to win a victory over the hardness of the human heart.

Dr. A. P. Shepherd traverses mostly familiar ground. He is an exponent of the Abelardian view of the Atonement; but is rightly anxious to safeguard it from being understood in too bare a way.

He makes the point against all satisfaction-theories that the maxim, "sin must be punished", belongs to the law of human society but is no standard by which to test the Divine action. On the contrary God transcends law, and simply forgives. But the energizing of this forgiveness cost Christ the Cross.

The *human personality* of Jesus gave God the instrument He needed for the bestowal of His Spirit. The Cross was the offering through which God could bring His whole Being into vital contact with men. It marked a new stage in the history of the world and revealed God's final purpose in creation. This was to bring all men to Himself, not by the sheer exercise of His power, but by the voluntary obedience of their free-will.

The book is semi-popular, but is thoughtful and should be useful.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Dilemma of Religious Knowledge. By C. A. BENNETT. Yale and Oxford University Presses. 10s. 6d.

This is a posthumous book by an Oxford man, who was for a time Professor of Philosophy in Yale University. He died at the age of 44, and apart from articles and reviews has left only this work of 120 pages, which is edited with an appreciative preface by his colleague, Prof. Hocking.

There is in the volume a great deal of real religious experience and concentrated thinking on the problems of religion. Its value is not to be measured by its size.

Bennett is concerned with the paradox of religion: it implies a knowledge of the Altogether Other, while it seems impossible that what is Transcendent should be known at all. He considers the different attempts to bring religion within the bounds of reason by treating it as something wholly subjective or at least wholly human.

There is the type of doctrine which views religion as a projection and objectification of human desires and ideals. But this is wholly wrong. We do not begin with our feelings and then deify them—we begin with an experience of God, and value religious feeling because of its contact with God.

The view that religion is a projection of the social ideal is equally baseless. One might perhaps imagine an apotheosis of society as it is, but the very existence of a social *ideal* is witness to the Transcendent which somehow enters our life.

Finally, to say that religion has its seat in the sub-conscious is worse than useless; unless it be added that the sub-conscious is open to God—Otherwise religion "suffocates" in the sub-conscious—what it needs, if it is to be kept alive, is "metaphysical respiration".

The strength of *The Dilemma of Religious Knowledge* is in analysis: it makes no attempt at synthesis. But the emphasis on the metaphysical element in religion is to be warmly welcomed.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Essays Congregational and Catholic. Edited by Dr. ALBERT PEEL. Congregational Union. 7s. 6d.

The editor has asked me to give an "outside" opinion of this aggregation of sixteen papers, which are true to their origin, and are "independent" of each other. He shall have one, though the task is not easy within a limited space. Five of the papers (Dodd, Bartlet, Cadoux, R. Mackintosh, Selbie) deal with Congregational principles; two (Peel, Powicke) with Congregational history; three (James, Tillyard and Spencer, Grieve) with the Congregational contribution to world evangelization, social service, and theology; the remaining six with general theological topics, any reference to Congregationalism being subsidiary. A more systematic grouping of the contents of the volume might have made it at least appear to be more of a unity, and a longer preface might usefully have enforced this.

An outsider's interest will lie chiefly in the first-named group of papers, which may be said to be answering the question "What is Congregationalism?" None of them gives a plain and systematic statement of the actual working of a Congregational Church, and of its precise relation to the machinery of the Congregational Union, surely a desideratum in a volume commemorating its creation. This would have been useful to outside readers, though it might have made some of the practical problems more apparent. The emphasis falls on the assertion of the principle that where two or three are gathered in the Name of Christ, He is present in their midst (*e.g.*, p. 62). The fundamental type of Christian experience so developed emphasizes personal religion (of the "twice-born" and "once-born" kinds) and the values of Christian fellowship. I have not found any adequate answer to the question why this "representative form of the Church universal" should base its polity on what seems the mere accident of locality. The claim that "full authority" belongs to such a local group obviously requires more to substantiate it than mere convenience of home-rule, and we cannot, at this date, be content with saying that "Congregationalism proper remains historically the truest of all to the distinctive features of New Testament Church order" (p. 50), or that the basic principle of Congregationalism is the basic principle of the Universal Church (p. 73); or that "Christianity as a polity, when trimmed of superfluous fat and reduced to its innermost essence, is Congregationalism" (p. 122). In fact the paper by Prof. Dodd corrects the onesidedness of these statements by shewing the eagerness of Paul "that the free local *ecclesia* should not only feel itself one in spirit with all other Christians, but should take practical steps, so far as in it lay, to give a body to that spirit" (p. 16).

My friend, Dr. Vernon Bartlet, will forgive me for saying that his passing reference to Baptists (p. 49) fails to grasp the real difference of *ethos* between the two denominations, and is historically incorrect. No adequate definition of the Baptist faith and life is given by calling them "the first sub-species of the *genus* Congregationalists", distinguished by withholding baptism from infants, and practising immersion. James Smyth, the first Baptist, did not practice immersion, and was led by his study of the New Testament to replace the "covenant" as the basis of

Church membership by the baptism of believers. From this stand-point it would be just as fair to describe Congregationalism as an arrested development on the way to a Church of baptized believers !

Next to the question of polity, the emphasis falls on the relative freedom of Congregationalism from authoritative creeds, and the famous words of John Robinson are cited three times (differently each time !). It is urged that the faith of Congregationalists is concerned with the *fact* of Christ, rather than with any particular formulation of it in doctrine. That this leaves difficult problems unsolved is fully recognized in the interesting paper on "Dogma and Freedom" by Dr. N. Micklem, who is prepared to accept the traditional creeds in a "symbolic" sense. By the way, will the remark of another esteemed friend of mine in this volume stand the test of sober enquiry :—"Historically Congregationalists have always denied the efficacy, value, and even legitimacy of creeds as tests of Christian opinion or standing" (p. 129)? I should have thought that Congregational history shews a full share of ultra-Calvinistic rigour, whatever may be true of the present.

I have purposely given most of the space allotted to me to what seemed the distinctive feature of this volume. We must not overlook the fact that it contains much other material of a useful kind. Dr. Peel's well-documented paper throws a good deal of light on the obscure period between 1558 and 1567, and on what may be called the prolegomena of the Separatist movements. Professor Price's competent essay recognizes both the value and the clear limitation of the psychology of prayer. Principal Franks gives a clear, constructive statement of the doctrine of the Atonement, from a Ritschlian standpoint. Principal Garvie shews that the emphasis of the Christian preacher should fall on grace, and warns against the interpretation of this as a "plan of salvation". Altogether there is much worth reading in the volume, and it is decidedly good value for its price, though its somewhat amorphous appearance, and the plethora of *symposia* in modern days, may tell against it. But I think that the Centenary of the Congregational Union was worthy of a more systematic and consistent volume than this, which exhibits the weakness of most *symposia, viz.* : that the most difficult problems are apt to fall into the interstices between the essayists.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

The Natural and the Supernatural. By John Oman. Cambridge Press. 18s.

Dr. Oman describes this book as "An attempt to lay a foundation for theology by considering its method and its problems". It is certainly all that, but it is also much more. It is at once a philosophy of religion and an apologetic for religion, and it may be safely said that no book of recent times has given us so thorough and comprehensive a treatment of the subject.

The main part of the book deals with the three great antinomies of religion, Knowing and Knowledge, Necessity and Freedom, the Evanescent and the Eternal, while the long and full introductory section on Scope and Method foreshadows the whole course of the ensuing argument. This involves the defence and justification of religion from the epistemological, the ethical, and the historical point of view. To Dr. Oman the supernatural is the world which manifests more than natural values, and he argues that

> awareness of the reality of the Supernatural is not something added to the sense of the holy and the judgment of the sacred by some kind of argument, say from the natural world. Where they are divorced, religion is identified with theology, and theology hung up in the air without any world of its own

> to work in; and the reality is sought in the theology instead of theology being, like other sciences, the study of a reality already given. The Supernatural must be inquired into, like the Natural, as a world in which we live and move and have our being, if it is to be inquired into with profit.

In the main part of his book Dr. Oman carries out this enquiry in the most thorough and painstaking fashion. His treatment of awareness and apprehension, of the individual and individuality, of forms of perception, sensation and values, is as convincing as it is suggestive, and the freshness of his presentation of familiar problems and of his discussion of familiar themes makes really delightful reading. Here, again, his main thesis is never lost sight of, as when he says:

> The wrong way of relating the Supernatural to truth, beauty and goodness is to set it over them as an external, legal, infallible authority, and make truth what has been thus revealed, right what has been thus required, and, if there be any place for beauty at all, it is only in its austere aspects as a handmaid of the sterner disciplines of faith and practice, and whatsoever things are lovely are left no standing in their own right, nor any reason why they should be thought of and sought for their own sake.

The section on Necessity and Freedom, in which Dr. Oman discusses the relation of the natural and the Supernatural to evolution, conscience, and the ideal and the real, is, perhaps, the finest and most important part of the work. It forms a necessary introduction to the section on The Evanescent and the Eternal, in which the author enters upon a sweeping survey of religion in its various forms of manifestation—the Primitive, the Polytheistic, the Mystical, the Ceremonial-Legal, and the Prophetic. Here a great deal of familiar ground is covered but often in a quite original way and in such fashion as to demonstrate the reality of the objectively Supernatural in all the manifestations of the sacred.

This brief characterization may serve to show that we have in Dr. Oman's book a work of first-class importance. It is evidently the result of a life-time of meditation on these great themes, and it is perhaps the first philosophical defence of religion which has been written in full view of modern developments in the natural sciences and in psychology. It is very refreshing to find a study of religion and the religious consciousness in which psychology is kept in its proper place.

One word of criticism. Dr. Oman's treatment of his subject is so thorough and so consistent that he tends to leave the reader to draw his own conclusions rather than to give him the definite guidance which he would sometimes prefer. The book ends rather than draws to a conclusion, and a final chapter gathering up the threads of the argument and setting forth the writer's position in definite terms would have greatly added to the value of a work for which, even as it is, we cannot be too grateful.

W. B. Selbie.

Social Substance of Religion. By Gerald Heard. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

The science of anthropology has made some important contributions to our understanding of the origin, development, and functioning of religion, but it is very easy to over-emphasize it, and the book before us is a good illustration of the dangers of so doing. Mr. Heard describes his work as "An Essay on the Evolution of Religion", and he finds the key to this evolution in man's relation to the community to which he belongs and its influence upon him. In the first part of the book he states his problem:

> It is how to account for conflict which is now found to be not merely the root of private neuroses, but of all social unrest and revolution, and next how to cure it. It is nothing less than the psychological attempt,

when the political and economic efforts have been found to deal only with symptoms and not with causes, to salvage civilization.

The second and main part of the book deals with the historical consequences of this conflict. In the solution of the problem religion, "because it is the one comprehensive attitude of the individual through his whole nature to the whole of experience", plays a very large part, mainly by the fusing of the individual into close and intense association with groups. The study of the relation of the individual to the group and of groups to one another Mr. Heard approaches first from the standpoint of what he calls "paleontological psychology", secondly from that of historical anthropology, and thirdly from that of psychology. In so doing he seeks to analyse man below the human and religion below worship, and from this analysis to build up the story of man's religious development in history. He is sure that religion is the real clue to all cultural and social evolution, and that if we can trace its history we shall find in it the clue to all history. Mr. Heard's treatment of history, however, is rather forced and schematic and illustrates the dangers of the purely objective treatment of the subject. He draws his illustrations from a wide area, but is rather inclined to select them in order to prove his point, and certainly exaggerates the importance of the sub-human, *e.g.*, the study of apes, in illustrating his thesis. What he says of the relation between food and fertility religions, and of the priority of food to sex in religious origins, is both striking and useful, but he carries his scheme of things too far, as when he comes to explain the way in which the central service of the Christian Church illustrates his point. He says:

> It began with a real meal. Food, as the nucleus of the group is therefore retained. After the feast there was singing. Rhythm is added, as we have seen it was added to the food interest in the building up of religion. The Primitive Church in its dynamic rite is recapitulating the history of religion's evolution. The small group of about a dozen leant over the cushion of the pulvinus, or sigma, and so formed an inward-looking group—perhaps a ring. There was a great cry of Sursum Corda (probably the oldest part of the Eucharist). It was the outbreak of exultation as the worshippers realized they were in the formed physic field. Then there was the kiss of peace, the manifestation of psycho-physical tenderness, the love that is an intensity of serenity.

There is no doubt that Mr. Heard has made a real and interesting contribution to a big subject under the limitations which we have suggested. His book follows a previous one, *The Ascent of Humanity,* and the two should probably be read together. It is never easy reading and is not rendered more so by the use of technical language and unnecessarily difficult words, *e.g.*, inenarrable and algolagniac. And why, oh why, is he so obsessed with the importance of the erotic in religious development? Has not one of his chief authorities, Malinowski, put this in a much truer perspective?

W. B. Selbie.

Desuggestion. By E. Tietjens. Allen & Unwin. 18s.

The problem of what life means and how to live it well is one that has always exercised thinking minds, and the aim of this book is to offer for this problem a final and emphatic solution. The author is a Russian who was impoverished by the revolution and removed to Berlin. His indefatigable translators, Eden and Cedar Paul, describe him as a confirmed neurotic who has been enabled to overcome his disabilities by practising the rule of life set forth in this book:

> Cease to fancy things which are non-existent or are entirely different from what you suppose—and you will achieve success; your understanding

> will grow; your mind and your nerves will enjoy the advantages of mental hygiene; and you will become the artificer of your own happiness.

In other words, lift yourself by your own waistband and all will be well. This, however, is anticipating, and Tietjens's book shows quite clearly that the matter is not so simple as it would seem. Man is subject to all kinds of delusions, and the delusion of freewill is the most mischievous of them all. That must be got rid of before anything like happiness can be achieved. The end of all human living is the attainment of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. Life is only intelligible in terms of pleasure and pain, and all human conduct must be directed to the achievement of the one and the escape from the other. Thus,

> The earth is by no means that "vale of tears" we suppose it to be. We make of it "a vale of tears" by our parassociations and erroneous ideas. Everything favourable to life is linked with pleasure, and everything noxious to life is linked with pain. If we had no parassociations and no erroneous ideas, all we need do would be that which is pleasurable, and all we need avoid doing would be that which is disagreeable—and such conduct would never signify "renunciation".

It is impossible in a brief review to follow the intricacy of Tietjens's argument. If we grant his premises there is a great deal that is plausible in his conclusions, and the case for a frankly Hedonistic and Determinist view of human life was probably never more attractively presented. Tietjens makes very solemn appeals to the intelligent reader and begs him to study carefully and to read repeatedly the words of wisdom which he utters. But the more intelligent the reader the more we fancy will he be inclined to feel that his leg is being pulled and the more uneasy will he be at the *naïve* assumptions on which much of the argument is based. If modern psychology has taught us anything it is surely to be suspicious of the kind of easy simplification of human motives and conduct on which Tietjens relies. No doubt we are all subject to delusions of many kinds, but among them we can hardly class the suspicion that things are not always as simple as they seem, that the human mind is something more than automatic response to an irritable substance, and that human life is wider than any mere appeals to appetite, higher or lower.

The intelligent reader, too, will be apt to suspect that Tietjens is neither so thorough nor so consistent as he would like to be thought. In spite of his rigidly Determinist attitude he constantly uses the word voluntary, though he tries to take the sting out of it by putting it in inverted commas. His use of inverted commas, indeed, is very irritating, and equally so is his adoption of the fantastic terminology of Semon in order to describe psycho-physiological phenomena which can be equally well described in very much simpler and more intelligible terms. Indeed, it is amusing to discover that even when he uses this terminology the author is constrained to put the plain English of it in brackets again and again. The reader is constantly held up by the necessity of explaining engram, engraphy, mneme, taxism, parassociation, and the like. What, for example, are we to make of this?

> In like manner a mnemic excitation (an idea) which does not occur for the first time synecphorises, by ecphory of the previously formed engram, a second mnemic excitation with which it is homophonic. If the two excitations are identical, the idea of acquaintanceship arises. If, however, they are not completely identical, there arises a differential sensation, and the difference serves as a stimulus. The result of this stimulus is, either that a new engram of abstract content arises or else that the idea seems to us erroneous.

If the intelligent reader succeeds in cutting his way through this jungle of jargon he will find a great deal in the book that is interesting and stimulating to thought. But we doubt very much whether it will enable him to free himself, as the writer claims, from misleading suggestions, and so become wise, happy, and virtuous. One is surely justified in asking—If freedom is impossible, why try to become free from anything?

W. B. Selbie.

A Study of Conversion: An Enquiry into the Development of Christian Personality. By L. Wyatt Lang, M.A. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

This is an important work because it carries the psychological analysis of conversion further than it has been taken by any previous writer on the subject and does so on sounder lines. Hitherto attention has been too closely confined to the actual conversion-crisis. Mr. Lang is too competent a psychologist to be content to begin there. He insists that we must know something of the childhood of the converted person and about the home in which he was brought up. His persistent following up of this trail has yielded important results. He has not solved all mysteries but he has let in a good deal of new light. In the normal conversion-process he finds three phases: recognition of the ideal, decision, activity. He has many penetrating things to say about difficulties in recognizing the ideal, about alienation from the ideal, and about religious phobias. For some of his material Mr. Lang goes to well-known cases (St. Teresa, Bunyan, Brainerd, John Newton, Col. Gardiner) but he has something fresh to say about them. He has, moreover, plenty of new cases for analysis, and is excellent in his examination of conversions in which there is no crisis. We were particularly struck with his analysis of the conversion of John G. Paton, the missionary to the New Hebrides.

Mr. Lang is the Vicar of St. Mark's, Plumstead Common. We do not know to which party in the Anglican Church he belongs, though there are one or two indications in his book that he has sacramentarian affinities. It would be interesting if our guess were correct, because Sacramentarians are, as a rule, inclined to disparage conversion as Evangelicals know it. Their tendency is to maintain that the sacramental system (together with preparation for Confirmation and First Communion) secures all that the Evangelicals obtain by "decisions". Mr. Lang is not at all sure about this, and freely expresses his doubts. But what is more important for Free Churchmen is that he is equally doubtful about the notion, so fashionable to-day, that we can educate men and women into the Christian way of life. His studies have led him to lay great emphasis upon the necessity for decision, as the following quotations will show.

> Without decision religion becomes inept. The attitude of recognition without acceptance is delusive. Decision sets free creative energy which is lost without decision . . . Insistence on decision has produced some of the greatest of Christian Saints in all sections of the Church, and especially among Protestants. The present tendency to smooth down the conversion-process by purely educational methods is likely to discourage the decision-crisis in conversion. (p. 257).
>
> The insistence which some churches make upon education, knowledge and reason as an evangelistic appeal, seems to be mistaken; the main religious appeal should be to gain a decision to have a Christian character, then knowledge and reason will be necessary and effective to confirm the decision . . . The educational method is too impersonal to be effective in changing centres of character. (p. 189).
>
> It frequently happens that a person is unconscious of his indecision. This appears to be the condition of many religious people; a grave weakness in religious bodies springs from the fact that a large proportion of their

members have never made a decision, but remain permanently in the stage of recognition. The creative energy which follows decision is therefore lost. (p. 199).

These are salutary warnings which we may all take to heart. They have added force, coming, as they do, from a man who obviously possesses an excellent scientific equipment and a scientific conscience which will not allow him to go beyond his data or to exaggerate a point.

Mr. Lang has no graces of style, and does not appear to realize that a book ought to be written in paragraphs if it is to avoid giving the impression of being a mass of notes and jottings. Many of his paragraphs consist of a single sentence. Many pages contain as many as six or seven paragraphs. We hope that these defects will not prevent the book being carefully studied by all who are engaged in the ministry of conversion. Their insight cannot but be deepened if they will read and ponder it.

A. C. Underwood.

A Study in Aesthetics. By L. A. Reid, M.A., Ph.D. Allen & Unwin. 15s.

Dr. Reid says that he almost agrees with those who tell him that aesthetics is an "impossible" subject, and, if it is not wholly impossible, it is at all events "as difficult as anything could well be". Those who have made any attempt to tackle the problems involved will hardly dissent from this view. All the more, therefore, is there reason to be grateful to him for a contribution to the subject which is always interesting and usually clear, with a clarity which is not achieved at the cost of burking the difficulties. He has, he tells us, "tried to deal with essentials, to ask the really important questions, to analyze each problem philosophically, and to build up bit by bit the statement of a constructive theory". Opinions will differ about the soundness of his views, but there is no doubt that the book is stimulating, and one to be reckoned with.

The author hopes to interest three groups of people, namely, those who read philosophy, critics of art, and artists, and he devotes a preliminary chapter to a defence of the philosopher's claim to enter the domain of aesthetics. This is admirably done, but it is a pity it should be necessary.

It is impossible here to indicate the whole range of the book. Brief reference to a few of the author's leading contentions must suffice.

The chief differentia between aesthetic and other experiences he finds in the quality of "imaginativeness", and so an object of perception becomes "aesthetic", and the contemplation of it "aesthetic", when it is contemplated "so that it appears in its very qualities and forms to express or embody valuable meaning", and this embodied meaning is "enjoyed intrinsically . . . and not for its practical, or cognitive, or existential implications". Our main concern in aesthetics is neither body nor meaning, but embodied-meaning, and therefore Dr. Reid holds with Prof. Alexander over against Prof. Lascelles Abercrombie that art is never a "translation" of a spiritual experience for the purposes of communication.

The view of beauty which he defends is that it is "perfect expressiveness". This at once raises a question in regard to ugliness. You cannot set up ugliness as another absolute but negative ideal, because "absolute ugliness" would mean absolute failure to attain expressiveness, *i.e.*, it would be the non-aesthetic. It is thus held by Prof. Croce and others to-day that the problem of the ugly in art is meaningless. But Dr. Reid points out that the non-aesthetic is not what we mean by ugly. Non-aesthetic facts (*e.g.*, "my Airedale is 15 months old") are not ugly. And are there not objects wholly hideous? For his solution of the difficulty we refer the reader to pp. 219 f.

There is not space to outline the treatment of such problems as those of "standards", of "truth and reality" in art, of art and moral values, of the competition and fusion of interests in works of art, *etc.* The final chapter is entitled "The Enigma of Natural Beauty". It is a cautious treatment of a most difficult problem, but the author leaves us in no doubt about the theistic conclusion to which his judgment would seem to lead him.

E. R. Micklem.

The Catholic Faith and the Industrial Order. By Ruth Kenyon. Allan. 6s.

The outstanding interest of this book is its orderly method of approach to the industrial problem from the standpoint of Christian principles. Miss Kenyon has given us an able and telling account of six years' discussion at the Anglo-Catholic Summer Schools of Sociology. The word "Catholic" in the title connotes "the appeal to the normal, the historical, and the world-wide in matters of faith". The Movement which produces it thinks of Christianity as a faith which "should provide a complete philosophy of life", and has done so, save in the two exceptional centuries which have preceded ours, when all parts of Christendom, Catholic and Protestant alike, forsook the true norm of Christianity, to which all alike are now striving to return. For these writers Catholicism means, then, essentially a return, not so much to the traditional forms of Christian worship, as to the full content of the Christian faith.

The "Church having thus practically abrogated her duty as philosopher and teacher on social matters in late years", an almost entirely secular conception of man's economic life has grown up. The Catholic revival is now setting to work to reclaim once more for religion and morality this large sphere of human activity. God must be put first in economic practice as in all else.

> No Christian would say otherwise; but it is in the specifically Catholic theology that this order of things leaps to the view; and it was in the attempt at a Catholic world-order in mediæval Christendom that the one consistent attempt to embody it was made.

Though some things are more peculiarly the province of religion, all things belong to God. So a paragraph is quoted from one of von Hügel's *Letters,* exhorting the recipient to care very assiduously for the things which belong to the natural order of life as a condition of entering deeply into the enjoyment of the supernatural:

> Just because you long for religion I want you . . . to continue to cultivate more carefully and lovingly, also the interests, the activities, that are not directly religious . . . because, without these you lose the material for Grace to work in and on.

That is why matters of State and matters of business cannot be allowed to claim a separate domain of their own. And, the more they are recognized as having divine sanction within their own provinces, the more likely they are to be kept within their proper limits.

Our tradition in this country has been to recognize the ultimate authority of religion, and, therefore, Parliaments, Municipalities, Friendly Societies and Trade Union Congresses on suitable occasions go to Church:

> It is only the special organizations of industrialism which do not do so. The F.B.I. does not go to church, nor does even the much older Bank of England, close though it lives by the City Companies, some of which do so still.

The competitive industrialism of our day has so manifestly declared itself aloof from the final claims of religion that Miss Kenyon sums up the matter by saying in italics: "Catholics ought to fight the modern system, because the modern system is sacrilege".

In feeling the way back to a Christian judgment upon industry, one of the most clearly and widely recognized principles is the respect due to personality. This happily is so much a part of the mental make-up of the Christian

> that he needs no hard reasoning before he can agree that if plutocracy or collectivism, mass-production or rationalization menace personality, they stand thereby condemned.

But that does not take us far toward a constructive alternative to the present system, and for that we must seek further. And in doing so a number of definitely constructive principles emerge.

Two of the leading Christian principles established in the Middle Ages and equally relevant to-day, as described by Sir Wm. Ashley in his *Economic History,* are the right of all classes to live a decent human life, and the control of money power by man (the principles lying behind the attempt to maintain "just prices" and the prohibition of usury). Dr. R. H. Tawney's *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* finds Ashley's summary valid, but adds a third essential doctrine, which he names a "Functional Theory of Society", according to which each social class and group within Society has rights which must be maintained by the State, but only so far as that class or group continues to perform the function in society for which it properly exists. The Church in fighting for its own rights as a group has incidentally been fighting the battle of these other groups.

From this there arises a definitely Christian doctrine of property, which regulates the right of different individuals to different amounts of property in respect of different functions they are performing.

> The characteristic feature of society should be the property-owning citizen existing and acting by means of his own resources, not dependent on the allotment of work to him by State or capitalist. . . . [So] Catholic students come to the study of Catholicism and Industry without any prejudice in favour either of the present industrial system, or of the ideal commonly accepted as its opponent, namely Socialism. . . It is by no accident that it has been Catholics such as G. K. Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc who have founded the Distributist School in England . . . which is concerned negatively to secure that the individual and the family may be in some degree independent of oppressive systems, official or unofficial; and positively to assure to the individual means for the encouragement of initiative, the growth of a sense of responsibility, and the opportunity of choice.

So much the book establishes in its first two chapters. The rest of the book deals with the duties and values that are binding on Christian people, beginning with the more direct and personal relations of individuals in industry and ending with the more intangible and impersonal forces of finance. The reader who finds the approach good will find the rest good also.

MALCOLM SPENCER.

Christian Higher Education in India. REPORT OF A COMMISSION. Oxford Press. 3s. 6d.

Racial Segregation in South Africa. By W. A. COTTON. Sheldon Press. 2s. 6d.

The Remaking of Man in Africa. By J. H. OLDHAM and B. D. GIBSON. Oxford Press. 2s. 6d.

On the appeal of the Colleges in India the International Missionary Council asked a Commission of six—Indian, American, and British—with the Master of Balliol as their Chairman, to visit India and produce a report on Christian Higher Education. The result is a volume of 388 pages for 3s. 6d., well written and as well printed! It begins with a vivid survey of the changing conditions which have reduced the relative influence of missionary education. The Commission believes that the Christian Colleges may recover the full quality of their influence if they will settle themselves to a special task, the adaptation of higher Christian education to the needs of the whole Christian community. It summons the Colleges to link themselves for the first time with the less educated and poorer Christians and to research into their economic, social, and religious needs. To do this the Commission asks for the closing of certain Colleges in order to concentrate effort in better centres and for a far larger measure of co-operative planning and interchange among the denominations. If the Missionary Societies at home and the Committees on the Field can recognize the day of their visitation a new era may well date from this fearless Report. It is rare to find vested interests so bravely set aside for the sake of the Kingdom of God. The argument for sufficient staff to do research properly would be greatly strengthened if the Report had also specified in so many words—what its argument obviously assumes—the need for research in the relation of the ordinary class-room subjects to Indian learning and tradition. Christian education ought to be supreme in quality because it has the spirit to understand, define, and incorporate the finest elements of India's previous culture. The members of the Commission will be the first to wish to add this plea to the very strong arguments of their Report.

Mr. Cotton is the author of *The Race Problem in South Africa,* which caused some sensation from the fact that it had the courage to protest against the doctrine that inter-marriage between people of different colours is inherently contrary to right feeling. In this second book he makes his position quite clear. His principle is that a nation must have a unified life and cannot tolerate two different civilizations side by side. He believes that there are two alternatives.

1.—A definite line of frontier (across which he would not permit any further native emigration) between the old established white settlements of South Africa, and all the territory to the north, where he would discourage any further white settlement and would have the country governed first and foremost for the advantage of the original occupants of the land.

2.—If white South Africans are not willing to accept the first alternative, the second is that inter-marriage should be frankly accepted in so far as it occurred naturally and that in the course of centuries it should be allowed to unify the nation.

If the opponents of miscegenation, as they so unpleasantly call it, are really in earnest in their opposition they will be glad to remove from the white race the temptation caused by contact. If on the other hand they are so eager to acquire further acres that they are willing to run the risk of contact, they must face it with open eyes. The third alternative is a caste system, likely to be even more disastrous for South Africa than it has been for India, to say nothing of its denial of the Christian doctrine of man.

Mr. Cotton has a deeply religious sense of the right of every man to home life and citizenship in the society which he helps to make. It is difficult to see how either Christianity or humanity can demand less than this. The author introduces some very effective quotations, and deals faithfully with the easy and misleading optimism of General Smuts in his Oxford

Lecture. At the end the reader asks whether white civilization will act as if it believes that human life is worth more than money, and whether the Church is prepared to stake her influence upon following Jesus to conclusions which look so perilous—whether she will lose her life in order to find it.

Here and there Mr. Cotton might have arranged his argument better. Sometimes he seems sentimental in his disregard of existing prejudice, and sometimes he seems to surrender the point for which he has just been fighting. But in the light of such a book as this the prejudiced advocates of white supremacy look much more sentimental. It is courageous, challenging, and very disquieting.

The third book is the result of three or four years of discussion by a group of educationists and missionary secretaries meeting in London and availing themselves of the help of African missionaries at home on furlough. The drafts have been discussed with the representatives of Continental and American Societies. The consequence is a book for specialists and African missionaries, which to them will be of the utmost value but will not make a general appeal to those without technical knowledge. The side-headings give the look of a Report. The fact that it covers most of Africa makes it of necessity general, and the style is official and a little *dreigh*. But for those concerned with the future of education, and especially of missionary education, it is of the utmost importance. It shows that for the African, more perhaps than for other nations, education must be religious in tone; that Christian education will be content with nothing less than the highest and will sacrifice many inefficient institutions to secure something typically good. It follows the wise impulse of modern Missions to think of education much more in terms of the training of personality and adaptability for natural native life, and to be dissatisfied with the mere acquisition of knowledge. It follows another welcome tendency in demanding a far greater humility on the missionaries' part in face of the ideals which often inspire African tribal life. In the finest education the white missionary and the African must learn side by side. The book has valuable appendixes summarizing the educational systems of Africa, Southern and Western.

FRANK LENWOOD.

Ellen Terry and Bernard Shaw. A Correspondence. Edited by CHRISTOPHER ST. JOHN. Constable. 21s.

There are speeches that change votes. There are books about which one's opinion changes as one reads. Such a one is this most remarkable correspondence. Without any adequate reason we assumed that it would be boring : we have to confess we find it entrancing from the first page to the last, or almost to the last. This correspondence must surely be quite unique. The famous actress writes to the young musical critic about a *protégé,* and from that point the correspondence goes on fast and furious and becomes, in Shaw's own words, "a paper courtship, which is perhaps the pleasantest, as it is the most enduring, of all courtships". Here is how the man describes it :

> Ellen and I lived within twenty minutes of each other's doorstep and yet lived in different worlds : she in a theatre that was a century behind the times, and I in a political society (the Fabian) a century ahead of them. We were both too busy to have any personal intercourse except with the people we were working with.

The correspondence developed, with many terms of endearment and expressions of affection, until "both felt instinctively that a meeting might

spoil it and would certainly alter it and bring it into conflict with other personal relationships". In 1896 and 1897 the two wrote to each other every three or four days, but the pace had begun to slacken before Shaw's marriage in 1898, after which the letters are more and more concerned with business of the theatre. It was not until 1900 that they met, and then there is silence for fifteen months. After their association in *Captain Brassbound's Conversion*, which Shaw wrote for Ellen, they met only rarely, but some correspondence was maintained down to her death. Only quotation can illustrate the nature of the letters of the early years. Much of it is professional, and much of it concerns Irving, but it is entirely *sui generis*. Here is a letter of 1896 :

> . . . . . I liked Henry, though he is without exception absolutely the stupidest man I ever met. Simply no brains—nothing but character and temperament. Curious, how little use mere brains are! I have a very fine set; and yet I learnt more from the first stupid woman who fell in love with me than ever they taught me.
>
> I *wont*, Wont, Wont, Wont, Wont, Wont, let you read Candida. I *must* read it to you, if I have to do it through the keyhole. But I, too, fear to break the spell : remorses, presentiments, all sorts of tendernesses wring my heart at the thought of materializing this beautiful friendship of ours by a meeting. You were quite right not to come in on Saturday : all would have been lost. In some lonely place, by starlight—stop : I am getting idiotic. Miss Terry : your servant! G.B.S.

Shaw believed that Irving had spoiled twenty years of Ellen Terry's theatrical life :

> Your career has been sacrificed to the egotism of a fool : he has warmed his wretched hands callously at the embers of nearly twenty of your priceless years ; and now they will flame up, scorch his eyes, burn off his rum-bathed hair, and finally consume him.

Ellen Terry's charm manages to conquer the years and the printed page. What can be more delightful than this :

> I never said Borkman was a "poor" play. What do you mean ? I say the effect on an audience would be to depress, to make unhappy, to make less hopeful some of us who long to dream a little. I think the theatre should gladden tired working people. I cannot imagine a greater happiness coming to me than to be well enough and free enough to just act "for nothing" all round England in little dull narrow-minded poky places—the people to come in for nothing (not to pay money I mean) and for me just to try to make them bright and happy for a few hours. But do you think I'd give them Borkman ? (Understand, I love it for myself. That's different). Poor dear people. No. They should have The Tempest with such lovely enchanting fairies, such graceful young things, such a lot of warm yellow limelight sunshine. They should have Much Ado, Merchant of Venice, Merry Wives, As You Like It, Olivia, Nance Oldfield, She Stoops to Conquer, Belle's Strategem, one of the Ford tragedies, The Lady from the Sea, Pillars of Society (properly done), oh, and heaps and crowds of nice things. But mostly I'd choose out of door scenes, and warm, happy, simple-worded and simple-thoughted plays, ending always happily, if possible!!

"We must read a life of Irving at once." That is the reaction on finishing the last page, and it is in itself evidence sufficient of the volume's interest.

EDITOR.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading).*

We wish some way could be discovered by which all Congregational deacons and Sunday School teachers could take a course in Prof. C. H. Dodd's *The Bible and Its Background* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.), a concise summary written in popular style. Would that it could be safely assumed that all of them had the knowledge it contains!

Dr. C. Ryder Smith's *What is the Old Testament?* (Epworth Press, 4s.) is written specially for lay preachers, but it meets a wider need. Christians who need a popular yet reliable Introduction to the *O.T.* need go no further than this book.

Every Man's Bible (Longmans, 7s. 6d.) is an anthology selected by Dean Inge, the passages being arranged in groups, the four main divisions being "God", "Christ", "The Christian Graces", and "The Christian Experience". The text is, with some exceptions, that of the *A.V.* To each group Dr. Inge prefixes an Introduction, while the general Introduction (nearly 50 pp.) forms a concise, but admirable New Testament Introduction.

The "Speaker's Bible" steadily continues publication, all the characteristics of previous volumes appearing in *John*, Volume I (Speaker's Bible Office, 9s. 6d.). This volume takes the Gospel down as far as 10^{13}.

One of the first lessons the Church of Christ will have to learn if she is to lead a revival in religion is that there must be a return to a teaching ministry. With that conviction, it is with pleasure that we notice the Rev. C. E. Hudson's *Outlines of Teaching Sermons for a Year* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d. and 2s.). The book is introduced by the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of St. Albans. It is the work of a St. Albans group, and has been carefully thought out, and contains all manner of suggestions for putting in into practice. The scheme of the sermons is as follows:

I. Grounds of Belief in God (5 sermons).
II. Introductory Sermons on the Old Testament (4).
III. The Life of Our Lord (12).
IV. "Life in Christ" (12).

We commend this book to ministers, not so much because the sermons may be of value in themselves, but because the ideal of a teaching ministry is one at which all ministers ought to aim.

Were it not for the belief, expressed elsewhere in these pages, that every book on preaching contains something valuable, we should have been too irritated by Dr. Adam Philip's *Thoughts on Worship and Preaching* (Clarke, 5s.) to get to the end. The book is extremely discursive and disjointed, and many of the pages give the impression that the writer has simply extracted quotations from a notebook kept over many years. Mention of "Maclure of Millhill" (how many Old Boys will recognize the School and "The Bird" thus disguised?) puts one off, as do sentences like the following in regard to visiting,

> which it is wise without, I think, much advertising, and in an unfussy way, to pursue in the interest of friendly feeling, and for the care of the sick.

When that has been said it is still true that many of Dr. Philip's quotations are valuable and pertinent, that most of his counsel is sound, and that it is well that his experience should be at the service of younger men. While

delivered with the Church of Scotland mainly in mind, the Lectures have their message for preachers of other Churches.

We commend Miss Margaret Cropper's *A Prayer Book for Boys and Girls* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) to all those who have to deal with children. They themselves will benefit by using its prayers, as well as the children whom they have to train. There are simple talks on subjects like "Learning to Pray" and "Getting Ready to Pray", and then prayers are suggested for different times and occasions.

With that book should be read Miss Muriel Lester's *Ways of Praying* (Indep. Press, 2s. and 1s.), the eight brief chapters in which deal with different kinds of prayer and are full of suggestion.

We must confess that we approached Dr. E. Lyttelton's *Whither?* (Murray, 7s. 6d.) with a prejudice. There rises before us a Congregational Church meeting for worship on Sunday evening, when it had been arranged that the service should be shortened so that Dr. Lyttelton could speak on the work of the League of Nations. So he did, but he arrived, not when the service began, but just in time to speak, and he left immediately, evidently feeling some degree of contamination from the concluding hymn and the benediction! We tried to cleanse our minds of this prejudice before opening this "Study of Shams and Safeguards". It is a peculiar book, which gives the impression of being articles written at different times now strung together on a thread not strong enough to bear them. With Dr. Lyttelton's contention in the early pages—that the form of Christianity popular to-day is a counterfeit, and far removed from the teaching of Christ—we are in agreement, and the succeeding chapters contain valuable suggestions. But as a whole the book is too scrappy to drive home any definite message: the titles of the chapters in Parts II and III will suggest its weakness: in Part II—"Popular Christian Ethics"—we have "Commerce and Overwork", "Marriage is a Vocation", "The Tower of Babel", "Rome and Nonconformity", "What Repels us from the Gospel?", and "Novels and Novel-reading"; in Part III—"What is at Stake"—the two chapters are "The Eternal Judgment" and "Satan".

While written definitely with the work of an Anglican parish in view, the Rev. E. S. G. Wickham's *Parson and People* (S.P.C.K., 2s.) contains many useful tips for workers in the Free Churches. The suggestions made for dealing with those about to be married are specially valuable.

Dr. F. W. Boreham's new volume bears the title *When the Swans Fly High* (Sharp, 5s.). It contains 20 papers of the kind all the world has come to expect from the Australian preacher. One of the best of them is "An Irritating Saint"—the story of an absent-minded preacher.

The Rev. P. T. R. Kirk's *The Movement Christwards* (Mowbray, 3s. 6d.) is a thoughtful little book, which aims at showing that all things are summed up in Christ, in Whom alone the needs of men can be satisfied. In chapters that deal with Creation, Science, Modern Psychology, Sex, Child Life, Political Economy, *etc.*, Mr. Kirk shows the significance of the Incarnation, and how Christ's way would lead to the solution of the world's problems.

What is the technique of being a Christian? What is a Christian's working philosophy of life? So someone asked Dr. Stanley Jones. In *The Christ of the Mount* (Hodder, 5s.) he gives the answer—"The Sermon on the Mount". Dr. Jones has discussed the Sermon with a group of 25 selected men and women, Indian and foreign, and this book has passed

their scrutiny. The Sermon on the Mount is essential; the Apostles' Creed is not. If the Church's Creed had been, "I believe in the Sermon on the Mount, and in its way of life, and intend, God helping me, to embody it", Dr. Jones suggests that the history of the world would have been very different. He then expounds the Sermon, with abundance of illustration from his life in India, and he concludes on the same note as Mr. Kirk's book —that it is the authority of Jesus the world needs, that only as all men, in India and the world over, catch the Spirit of Christ can their problems be solved.

Two little books by Congregationalists (S.C.M., 3s. 6d. each) that ought not to be missed are the Rev. Malcolm Spencer's *Vitality* and the Rev. E. Shillito's *Poetry and Prayer*. Both are very suggestive. Mr. Spencer shows how zest and spirit can be added to life through communion with God. Mr. Shillito allies poetry and prayer in chapters which deal with *The Testament of Beauty, Othello, The Torch Bearers, The Hound of Heaven,* Browning, and other poets. The Chapter on "Poetry and the 'Communion of Saints' " should be a great encouragement to many worshippers.

Dr. G. S. Marr, the author of *Christianity and the Cure of Disease* (Allenson, 5s.) has degrees in Arts, Divinity, Medicine, and Literature, and should, therefore, be abundantly qualified to speak on his subject. He argues that Jesus healed men; that the Church, when it has had faith, has healed men; that the Church could still exercise the ministry of healing did its disciples believe. Dr. Marr rapidly outlines the relation of Christianity to disease from the time of Christ to the present, and quotes some striking examples of cures by faith and suggestion.

The new volume in "The Scholar as Preacher" Series—*The Highway of God* (Clark, 7s.)—is by Dr. H. R. Mackintosh, who has just received the highest honour the Church of Scotland can give. These twenty sermons reveal the new Moderator as a scholarly, sympathetic expounder of the Scriptures, one who never lowers the tone of the pulpit by employing cheap methods or artifices of any kind.

Another volume of sermons is Archdeacon R. H. Charles's *Courage, Purity, and Truth* (Blackwell, 6s.). When Charles's researches had made him the greatest authority in the world on Apocalyptic, he was offered a Canonry of Westminster. He speedily found that his sermons were emptying the Abbey, and when we learn that these sermons formed the "Home University Library" volume, *Religious Development between the Old and the New Testaments,* we cannot wonder, valuable as that little book is. As this volume of sermons shows, Charles managed to make his preaching less academic, but he was never a "popular" preacher: a congregation willing to share with him in the search for truth was what he required. The Archbishop of Armagh writes a Memoir of his friend. It is strange to find him twice mis-spelling Dean Farrar's name.

Dr. F. J. Foakes-Jackson's *The Church in England* (Cambridge Press, 2s. 6d.) is part of a volume in the series "The Christian Religion", edited by Dr. Bethune-Baker. Whether deliberately written for that purpose or not, it can scarcely escape becoming a "cram book" for theological students —it summarizes the story and the present position of the Anglican Church so succinctly.

Mr. Kenneth D. Mackenzie's *Anglo-Catholic Ideas* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.) fills us with despair. Here we have the old narrow conception of "Catholic", the old uncritical acceptance of whatsoever bolsters up that

conception, the old assumption that the "separated bodies" deliberately "reject the Catholic ideal".

Readers of these pages have good reason to know that the Rev. H. F. Lovell Cocks is an extremely thoughtful and suggestive writer. His little book, *The Faith of a Protestant Christian* (Indep. Press, 1s.), is an excellent example of his work which ministers would do well to pass on to their young people.

Mr. J. W. Whittome's *The Local Preachers' Efficiency Course* (Stockwell, 5s.) is an extremely practical outline of training which has been tried for twenty years, lessons being sent out fortnightly. Ministers, as well as lay preachers, could benefit greatly by following Mr. Whittome's counsel and learning from his shrewd hints.

The Rev. F. Clarke Bourne's *Fulfil Thy Ministry* (Skeffington, 3s. 6d.) is an Anglican Rector's appeal to clergy and ministers to do the work of evangelism. In his suggestions for running missions Mr. Bourne makes much use of the experience of the Rev. Lionel Fletcher.

Once more the National Adult School Union has provided an admirable outline for a year's study, the title being **Belief and Life* (2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d.). Ministers and leaders of Senior Departments must not fail to get this Handbook.

We fancy that most of the Sunday School and many of the Day School teachers who listened to Dr. B. A. Yeaxlee's six lectures, *The Approach to Religious Education in Sunday Schools and Day Schools* (S.C.M., 4s. and 2s. 6d.) must have been both surprised and bewildered by Dr. Yeaxlee's treatment. That would certainly be the case if they expected anything "practical". Dr. Yeaxlee dealt with the biological, psychological, philosophical, Biblical, theological, and personal ways of approach, quoting liberally from modern writers. His survey would be useful for those who had sufficient grounding, but we fear it is true to say that it would be above the heads of 90 per cent of Sunday School teachers.

Sunday School officials and all who have to arrange entertainments for young people will be very grateful to Mr. S. G. Hedges for his *More Games for Socials* (N.S.S.U., 1s.), in which he describes 118 games of various kinds, while leaders of Junior, Primary, and Beginners' Departments will be equally grateful for Miss Doris W. Street's *The Book of Play Hours* (Ludgate Circus House, 2s. 6d.), which contains games, lists of books from which children's stories can be obtained, *etc.*

Mrs. Naomi Mitchison has won well-deserved recognition as a writer of stories for boys and girls, and the ten stories in *Boys and Girls and Gods* (Watts, 1s. 6d.) will be found useful by teachers as well as readable by the children themselves.

Five Primary workers contribute to *New Primary Stories* (N.S.S.U., 1s.), edited by Miss Bertha C. Krall. Four of the stories are Seasonal, two deal with Nature, four with Saints, and four are General.

The Bishop of Croydon writes a Foreword to Mr. J. H. Grummitt's *The Sacrament of Life* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), a little book written for boys by a schoolmaster. It deals in very successful fashion with loyalty to Christ in every-day life. While written specially for boys at Confirmation, it could be given to young people on joining the Church.

Two volumes of very good children's addresses have just been published by the Student Christian Movement. They are as different as can be, Dr.

J. C. Carlile's *Sermons Without Words* (3s. 6d.) being in the old style, and the Rev. McEwan Lawson's *The Five Pigs and Other Curly Tales for Young and Old* (2s. 6d.) in the new—or rather in the style peculiar to McEwan Lawson. How does the man think of these things?

Two more books by Congregationalists. Prof. J. G. McKenzie's *Personal Problems of Conduct and Religion* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) contains answers to questions submitted to him month by month in *The Sunday at Home*. Dr. R. S. Birch's *Psychology and the Individual* (Sampson Low, 5s.) contains little that is new or original, but there is abundant need for repetition of the idea that ministers and teachers should recognize the importance of work among individuals. A recovery of the pastoral instinct, of the condition when the shepherd knew his sheep individually, is a *sine qua non* of the revival of religion. Parents would be well advised to ponder Dr. Birch's dictum: "The vital part in the education of the individual in the truth and power of religion is really in the early life". In almost all the illustrations Dr. Birch gives from his clinical experience the root of the trouble is to be found in childhood.

Canon W. L. Paige Cox calls his *Reaction and Progress in Religion* (Heffer, 5s.) a " Historical Retrospect with Present-day Illustrations ". He has taken Hooker as exemplar, and follows him in trying to get behind controversies to principles. The Anglo-Catholic position and practice he holds to be reactionary, and repeatedly insists that the Church of England is a Reformed Church. After a suggestive digression about Newman, Canon Cox asks how the Church of England can proceed from reaction to revival. Among other things he stresses the education of the clergy, and he points out that in Anglo-Catholicism, as always, pre-occupation with ritual, the external and the spectacular, relegates the ethical to an inferior place. An Appendix which includes a sermon on "The One Body and The One Bread", preached in Chester Cathedral, concludes a study which is worth reading by non-Anglicans as well as Anglicans.

Mr. Bertrand Russell is many things in one, and this makes him one of the most "intriguing" personalities of our time. In religion an obscurantist, in mathematics a scholar, on many points a demagogue and on some a prophet, often a humorist when he does not intend to be one, Mr. Russell is never dull. All these features may be observed in *The Scientific Outlook* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), a lively volume divided into three parts—"Scientific Knowledge", "Scientific Technique", and "The Scientific Society"—in which Mr. Russell tells us a good deal of what he thinks about the world, past, present, and future. Mr. Russell is evidently finding Sir Arthur Eddington and Sir James Jeans something of an embarrassment; probably he deems it unfortunate that the lethal chamber which plays its part in the scientific society of the future cannot be brought forward a millenium or two!

In *More Lay Thoughts of a Dean* (Putnam, 7s. 6d.) Dean Inge reprints over thirty of his contributions to the *Evening Standard* together with three Lectures — "English Religious Poetry", "Scientific Ethics", and "Democracy". The result is an uneven but stimulating volume, the Essays being the best part of it. Dean Inge ranges over a wide field, and sometimes the articles give the impression of a dive into commonplace books while the printer's devil was waiting for copy, but generally, whether the subject is "Ambition", "Thoughts on Reading", "Women in Politics", or "Cricket, Past and Present", something incisive will be found. In the

Lecture on "Democracy", delivered in America, the Dean trailed his coat with a vengeance!

In *Our Superconscious Mind* (Allan, 10s. 6d.) Dame Edith Lyttelton investigates some of the activities of what is normally called the subconscious—dreams, mind pictures, knowledge of past, present, and future events, sometimes apparently imparted with a motive. Dame Lyttelton limits the term "subconscious" to

> the desires, impulses, and egoistic emotions which are in the main concerned with our physical nature, including fear and various kinds of unremembered facts and feelings, some racial, some individual, not normally held in consciousness.

In the "superconscious" she places

> forms of perception, not acquired through the senses, such as knowledge of what is passing, or has passed, at a distance in time or space : what is about to happen ; and the kind of vision which is either called prophecy or inspiration.

After illustrations of the different kinds of superconscious knowledge Dame Lyttelton examines the inspiration of Hebrew prophets, mysticism, genius, and the phenomena presented by mediumship, ending with a study of the mind of Christ, and the possibility of such communication that men may become "fused personalities", knowing themselves as sons of God.

A book that stirs the mind and calls for thoughtful examination.

Two useful volumes in "The Forum Series" (R.P.A., 1s. and 7d.) are Prof. G. Elliot Smith's *The Search for Man's Ancestors,* and Dr. B. Hollander's *Seeing Ourselves in the Light of Modern Psychology,* although the latter tails off into an examination of spiritism.

The publication of Ellen Key's *Lifslinjer* began in 1903. Not until 1931 has an English translation of the first two volumes appeared, under the title *Love and Marriage* (Putnam, 4s. 6d., an astonishing low price for a book of nearly 400 pages). The book seems by no means as revolutionary now as when it was written. The translation reads very well, and even when the reader cannot agree with the famous feminist, he cannot but admire the force and dignity with which she writes. Mr. Havelock Ellis contributes an Introduction. The book deserves the careful consideration of all students of the fundamental question of sex.

Mr. George Pitt-Rivers has not yet learnt that violence is not necessarily convincing, and that the pioneer must needs use all the arts of persuasion. With many of the points which constitute his eugenics programme in *Weeds in the Garden of Marriage* (Douglas, 3s. 6d.) we are in agreement, but we cannot imagine a single doubter being won over by propaganda of this kind. *Suaviter in modo,* sir!

The work of the *New Survey of London Life and Labour* is proceeding apace, and it is pleasing to see the second volume so soon after the publication of the first one. Vol. II (P. S. King, 17s. 6d.) embodies the first part of the survey of London industries. It deals with building and engineering (the two largest male industries), furnishing and wood-working, clothing, boot and shoe making and repairing, dock labour (the most important casual occupation), and domestic service (the largest women's industry). Again there is an abundance of tables and charts by means of which a comparison with Booth's survey can be made and the changes that have come over the different industries through the last forty years readily seen.

In *Poverty in Plenty* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.) Mr. J. A. Hobson argues that

> our main economic troubles are of a distinctly moral origin. An element of inequitable force, penetrating all the marketing arrangements by which wealth is distributed among those who, by personal activity or possessions, contribute to the productive processes, is seen to paralyze productivity, causing unemployment and waste of all the productive powers of nature and of men.

The selfish pursuit of personal gain has a paralysing influence :

> Until the claims of the individual worker, the industrial group, and the economic community (national and international) can be brought into reasonable and equitable adjustment by some machinery of economic government, civilization must remain an exceedingly precarious process.

We strongly recommend all who wish to understand the present economic situation to read Mr. Hartley Withers's **Everybody's Business* (Cape, 10s. 6d.). Mr. Withers had already shown himself to be a clear exponent of financial problems, but he has done no better work than this very timely book, the success of which is in large measure due to the style in which it is written. In conversational language that everybody can understand, Mr. Withers unravels the tangles of modern trade, industry, and finance : that which is intricate is made to appear comparatively simple, and the average reader will feel that at long last he begins to understand the mysteries of gold, currency, and exchange.

Of course, the attempt to write a popular book of this kind has its dangers. Sometimes the author seems a little too easy and casual; sometimes he merely touches on aspects of the problem where the reader would like guidance—bimetallism being a case in point; sometimes he seems to have his tongue in his cheek, as when he propounds an economic defence of hunting. But "by and large"—a favourite expression of Mr. Withers's—the book is extremely valuable and should have a wide sale.

Mr. V. A. Demant's **This Unemployment: Disaster or Opportunity?* (S.C.M., 4s. and 2s. 6d.) is well worth reading as a stimulating study of the great economic riddle at present puzzling the world. Mr. Demant has small patience with orthodox economists and financiers, but those who think rationalization or protection will solve the industrial problems of this country would do well to study Mr. Demant's analysis and examination. As often, the constructive part of the book is nothing like so good as the critical section, and it surely behoves the Christian Science Council, who sponsor the volume, to set an example in this regard. But the book will make any reader think, and we strongly commend it to all students of the present situation.

Sir George Paish's *The Way to Recovery* (Putnam, 7s. 6d.) is only a slight book, and the Preface is dated 25 June, since when much water has run under the bridge; nevertheless it contains a clear account of the world crisis, and suggests a way out in an international conference of statesmen and financiers, and a revision of the tariff policy of the world.

> All experience indeed proves that the road to prosperity runs in the direction of encouraging every nation to produce the commodities for which it is specially gifted and to exchange its products freely for those, whether raw or manufactured, which other nations are specially qualified to produce, and that just in proportion as this change takes place, trade expands and the standard of life throughout the world rises to higher levels.

We wish all those who are asking for tariffs would study this sketch, and especially note the sentence about America :

> In keeping out the goods that other nations needed to sell her she is, however, effectively keeping in her own goods and produce.

Sir George emphasizes that the present financial crisis has arisen in consequence of the lack of harmony between the political and economic policies of the nations. He believes that the steps that are necessary are

> the forgiveness of reparation indebtedness, the cancellation of the so-called Inter-Allied debts, the removal of all hindrances to both national and international trade, and the provision of new capital and credit for world development.

This is the time of Centenaries, and one of the most interesting of them is commemorated in Sir R. Murray Hyslop's *The Centenary of the Temperance Movement* (Indep. Press, 1s.). In twelve vivid chapters Sir Murray surveys the growth of Temperance in England since the time of the Reform Bill and the emergence of the seven men of Preston. Temperance workers often labour under many discouragements, and it is well that their services should be recognized. We are glad to see that the part played by Alexander Hannay is duly chronicled.

An old pupil of Professor A. J. Grant's approaches *A History of Europe, 1494-1610* (Methuen, 16s.)—one of the "History of Medieval and Modern Europe" series—fully aware that he will meet accurate history set forth in readable style. Professor Grant's *Outlines of European History* has long been recognized as a masterly little book, in which the main facts of 3,000 years are presented with such lucidity that even when so compressed the interest is never lost. Professor Grant has skilfully surmounted the difficult obstacle of arrangement, and altogether his survey provides a valuable book of reference. Our only criticism is that it might just have indicated the importance of Anabaptism in the future development of religion. Historians of the Free Churches in this country now unite with scholars like Troeltsch in finding in Anabaptism one of the most significant movements in the history of religion. The maps are a feature of the book, and there are useful bibliographies.

Mr. E. H. Broadbent's *The Pilgrim Church* (Pickering, 7s. 6d.) is a difficult book to review, for it does not appear for whom it is intended. If compiled for those who have no knowledge of church history, and as a basis for further study, it can do no harm, but otherwise it could be most misleading. No man can be an authority on all the developments of the Pilgrim Church for the last 19 centuries, and there are abundant evidences that the author's reading is both limited and not up-to-date. Dr. Workman's *Wycliffe*, for example, is not mentioned, while the books relied on for the Free Churches are Skeats and Silvester Horne. Nevertheless, a great deal of work has gone to the making of the book, and if only those who read it will read with care, and make it a starting point for further study, it might, in the long run, save time. The point of view from which Mr. Broadbent writes is obvious, and therefore harmless.

Following a precedent set in 1572, we should not be surprised if the Pope were to order a medal to be struck when Dr. G. G. Coulton shuffles off this mortal coil. Dr. Coulton never lets go, and woe betide the Roman Catholic controversialist who ventures to engage with him. In No. 20 of his "Medieval Studies", *Jesuits and the Middle Ages* (Simpkin, 1s.), Dr. Coulton deals, in the main, with critics of his article on "The Reformation" in the new *Ency. Brit.*

The flood of Gandhi literature still continues. It is probably true to say that no living person has had so much written about him. The man, his history, his ideas, his outlook, have been described, revealed, expounded, commended, criticized.

First we have the second volume of Gandhi's own story, edited by Mr. C. F. Andrews, under the title *Mahatma Gandhi at Work* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.). This volume is largely occupied with Mr. Gandhi's experiences in South Africa. There we see the beginning of the *Satyagraha* Movement, and, indeed, the essence of all Mr. Gandhi's teaching to-day. Those who wish to master his attitude and understand his belief in moral resistance must study the book, a footnote to which is found in Mrs. Polak's *Mr. Gandhi: The Man* (Allen & Unwin, 5s. and 3s. 6d.), which gives an intimate picture of the life at Phoenix and of Mr. Gandhi's schemes of education, healing, and self-discipline.

Brigadier-General F. P. Crozier's *A Word to Gandhi* (Williams & Norgate, 4s. 6d.) suffers from its extreme stridency. General Crozier becomes almost hysterical as he describes the Black-and-Tan *régime* in Ireland, and expounds his fears lest the same or worse should befall in India. There is reason for his alarm, but his end would have been better served had his case been presented in a calmer and more judicial manner.

Maria Edgeworth: Chosen Letters (Cape, 12s. 6d.) makes a very readable volume. As you follow the authoress through her long life—at home with the big family at Edgeworthstown, visiting France, England, Scotland, or Wild Connemara, you frequently mark passages for entry in your commonplace book. Rousseau and Sir Walter Scott (her great hero), Elizabeth Fry, Mrs. Siddons, and Sir Humphrey Davy, she meets all these and gossips pleasantly about them. We learn what she thinks of Jane Austen and of Waverley, and how to the end of her day she finds delight in books. Altogether an attractive selection, excellently introduced by Mr. F. V. Barry.

It is unfortunate that Dr. John Lamond, the editor of the memoir, *Arthur Conan Doyle* (Murray, 10s. 6d.), deems that Sir Arthur's Spiritualist adventures were far more important than anything else he ever did. We feel all the time that Dr. Lamond is impatient to get over the years when his subject was writing Sherlock Holmes and adventure stories in order to reach the last decade when he became an exponent of Spiritualism. Sir Arthur's was a strong and versatile personality, and it is a pity his biography is so overbalanced. The brief Epilogue by Lady Conan Doyle inclines us to wish that she had herself undertaken the whole book.

Arnold Bennett was married in 1907, and separated from his wife in 1921. In *My Arnold Bennett* (Nicholson & Watson, 8s. 6d.) Mrs. Bennett has revealed to us the husband she knew during those years—very much of a spoilt child, and far from easy to live with, and yet with no small degree of charm. Mrs. Bennett was French, and it was in France she provided Bennett with the home and quiet where he wrote *The Old Wives' Tale*. There are interesting descriptions of the way in which Bennett wrote his books and plays, entertained his friends, spent his money, and ordered his life. Many well-known French and English writers flit across the pages, which end with the striking tribute from *Punch* when Bennett died.

The welcome accorded to the first volume of extracts from Sir James Crichton-Browne's note-books has caused him to publish *The Doctor's Second Thoughts* (Benn, 7s. 6d.). During his long life Sir James has met

many interesting people, and he has never lacked the courage of his opinions. This volume contains jottings of all sorts—some of them serious, some of them humorous. Perhaps the following may be quoted as examples:

> In all scientific difficulties refuge is to be found in billions of years. A new man on an old estate grumbled over a bad day's shooting, saying that on a previous occasion he had sent away "four hundred braces!" "In that case, my dear fellow", said one of the guests, "you can scarcely expect to keep up your bags".

Though Miss Fredegond Shove in her study, *Christina Rossetti* (Cambridge Press, 5s.), is prepared to admit that Christina's prose falls short of perfection, she will make no such admission in regard to the poems, but indulges in almost entirely uncritical panegyric. It is pleasant in these days to have championship of this kind, and if the chapter on the poems becomes little more than an anthology, an excellent anthology it is. And, of course, a good case can be made out for ranking Christina Rossetti with Tennyson as the supreme lyrists of their day. Miss Shove finds the secret of Christina's poetry in her religion, " love of God being the heart-pulse and mainspring of her whole poetic output ".

Mr. S. M. Ellis's *Wilkie Collins, Le Fanu, and Others* (Constable, 18s.) may be called "A Study in Also Rans". It deals with candidates who obtained some of them good seconds, some of them only thirds, in the literary world of the mid-nineteenth century. Not, of course, that all these writers knew they were second-rate only; Mortimer Collins said, for example,

> As a poet, I am below Browning in insight, above him in lyrical power, and a trifle above Tennyson in both. As a novelist, I am less successful that Thackeray because I take less pains, but far superior to your Trollopes and Wilkie Collinses.

The volume is thus a study in literary reputations—who knows Mortimer Collins to-day? Not long ago we examined a large number of his manuscript letters to the Editor of the *British Quarterly Review;* he seems to have been prepared to write upon almost any subject. The writers Mr. Ellis deals with are Wilkie Collins, his brother Charles, his namesake Mortimer, R. D. Blackmore, J. S. Le Fanu, Edward Bradley, George Lawrence, Thomas and Mary Ann Hughes, Joseph Crossley, and Mrs. J. H. Riddell. Bibliographical hand-lists are furnished, and the volume will be valued by those who like to get off the high-roads of Victorian literature.

Mr. Ellis goes a little farther along one particular by-way of this literature in *Henry Kingsley, 1830-1876* (Richards, 12s. 6d.), the sub-title of which is "Towards a Vindication". He has evidently been moved to embark on this study by statements that Henry Kingsley drank too much, and so ruined himself. While claiming that this charge is exaggerated, Mr. Ellis brings out very well the gradual deterioration in Kingsley's character and in the quality of his work, and shows how his frequent demands for money disturbed his brother Charles and annoyed Mrs. Charles. Many examples of Henry's descriptive writing, a large number of his letters, and a bibliography help to make a volume that fills a niche left vacant for a surprisingly long time.

The aim of Mr. J. A. T. Lloyd's *The Murder of Edgar Allan Poe* (Stanley Paul, 18s.) is to prove that Poe, in his life and after it, was the victim of the implacable hatred of his literary executor and biographer, Dr. Rufus Griswold. There are few denunciatory epithets Mr. Lloyd does not employ,

but he never succeeds in explaining the cause of the extraordinary malignancy he attributes to Dr. Griswold. He has to admit that the ex-Baptist minister gave Poe financial help in at least one of the many crises in the poet's affairs, and that he was appointed literary executor by the poet himself. It is possible to pity Poe as well as to blame him, and no doubt he had many detractors, but Mr. Lloyd's violence does not convince us that "cunning raised to the nth power" was employed to work his ruin. Mr. Lloyd's own critical judgment may be measured by his opinion that the Brownings "weigh lightly enough in the scales" against Poe, and the fact that apparently he is not adverse to recognizing Poe as "the American Shakespeare".

Mrs. Williams Kirby's *William Prynne: A Study in Puritanism* (Harvard & Oxford Presses, 10s. 6d.) is a typical piece of American research. A good deal of labour has gone to its making, and the bibliography will be of use to students of the period, while the biography itself fills a gap in the history of the period, for strangely little has been written about "Marginal Prynne", as Milton calls him. Mrs. Kirby, however, does not seem to have assimilated the literature and the contemporary documents of the period, and especially in the dealing with ecclesiastical matters does not altogether inspire confidence. In spite of this weakness, the book will save research students a good deal of time.

Mr. John Drinkwater's autobiography is by no means so massive as Theodore Dreiser's, although his first volume, *Inheritance* (Benn, 10s. 6d.), only brings him down to the age of 15, when he left school. For once in a way, the phrase "labour of love" may be fitly used, for Mr. Drinkwater has obviously enjoyed writing about his forbears—the Drinkwaters, innkeepers, coach proprietors, and drivers; the Browns, farmers and tradesmen. There is the authentic note in Mr. Drinkwater's descriptions of country life near Oxford, and his memory revels in recalling the scenes of his boyhood.

Of his school days he writes vividly and with zest. Readers will share his enjoyment, and look forward to succeeding volumes.

Mr. Eric Linklater is a practised novelist, and he would perhaps have been wise to call his *Ben Jonson and King James* (Cape, 10s. 6d.) an historical novel. The book, however, is supposed to be history, and many will fall foul of Mr. Linklater's methods. Colour in historical writing is all to the good, but when colour becomes conjecture we get something less —or more—than history. Mr. Linklater has given us a pleasant and readable account of the life and times of Jonson, and the fact that we enjoyed the book far more than we expected to do must be set to its credit. There is something reminiscent of Macaulay about Mr. Linklater's style.

Mr. R. L. Mégroz will probably be surprised to learn that we not only found his *Ronald Ross* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) very unequal, but that the first part seemed vastly superior to the second. There, in his description of Ross's discovery of the anopheles mosquito, he seems to have been infected by Ross's own enthusiasm, and he infects the reader too. The chapters on Ross's work as poet, dramatist, and novelist are much more prosaic, though once, in his summary of *The Child of Ocean,* Mr. Mégroz again becomes absorbingly interesting. This volume will surprise many readers in its revelation of Sir Ronald's versatility—in mathematics, as well as in the fields mentioned above, he has made a distinct contribution.

Perhaps the book we have most relished this quarter is Mr. Arthur Waugh's *One Man's Road* (Chapman & Hall, 18s.). The pleasure

we have had in walking along the road with Mr. Waugh makes us regret that last year we somehow missed his *A Hundred Years of Publishing,* the history of the firm of Chapman & Hall, of which he was for so long Managing Director. We have read few pictures of boyhood years so clear, intimate, and pleasing as Mr. Waugh's, while the account of his experience as free lance, reviewer, and publisher's reader we naturally perused with great eagerness. Mr. Waugh has always lived with zest and spirit; in amateur theatricals and on the cricket field as well as in the work of life he has always found keen pleasure. When he grew older he began to live a new life in his sons, even while living his own with all its friendships and intense activity.

Students of English letters and journalism would be well advised not to miss Mr. Waugh's pages, especially those dealing with the years round about the nineties, while editors, publishers, and authors could learn a great deal from the experience of this genial and shrewd friend who has walked along the road before them.

The subject of the Rev. A. D. Martin's *Doctor Vanderkemp* (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.) was born at Rotterdam in 1747, and died at Cape Town in 1811 (we had to search the book for the dates and wish that Mr. Martin had given us a chronological table). A medical student, then an officer in the Army, pride and lust led him astray. He married, turned over a new leaf, qualified as a doctor in Edinburgh, and after a long conflict was converted in 1791, and soon after the formation of the London Missionary Society in 1795 offered himself for service. He was ordained in London as a Presbyterian in 1797, inspired the formation of a Dutch Missionary Society, and in 1799 he arrived at Cape Town. The race problem in South Africa is far from being solved to this day, and great were the problems that faced the pioneer. Vanderkemp's heroic struggles for Kafirs and Hottentots, and his conflicts with the Colonists followed, while in 1806 his own attitude to the race problem was revealed by his marriage to a 17-year-old Malagasy slave.

Such is the material on which Mr. Martin has had to work, and readers of these pages need not be told that he has woven it into a stirring and fascinating story.

The Rev. R. H. Carson Graham's *Under Seven Congo Kings* (Carey Press, 6s.) shows that the heroic days of Christian Missions are by no means over. After George Grenfell and Comber had made preliminary investigations at San Salvador, Mr. and Mrs. Graham took up work there in 1886, and only retired in 1923. To Mr. Graham's narrative useful appendixes are added, together with a bibliography.

We hope many young people will read Mr. Jesse Page's *Samuel Crowther* (Pickering, 2s.), the story of a boy, once a slave, who became a Bishop. Bishop Crowther himself read the proof-sheets of the book, which should be an inspiration to all readers.

Prof. Gilbert Murray's translation of *Prometheus Bound* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. and 2s.) has given us the pleasure of reading once again what is, perhaps, the most characteristic of the plays of Aeschylus. The Introduction—in which Prof. Murray argues that the play was produced soon after the eruption of Etna in 479 B.C.—and the Notes are models.

If the test of a book be that it leaves the reader thirsting for more and anxious to know what becomes of its characters, then in *Judith Paris* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.) Mr. Hugh Walpole must have achieved one of his greatest successes. The book simply leaves the reader longing for the

autumn of 1932, when he will learn how the duel between Judith and Walter Herries progresses. *Judith Paris* continues the story begun in *Rogue Herries,* and Mr. Walpole has planned two further volumes in which the fortunes of the Herries family will be described. The scene of this Herries saga is the Lake District, and all lovers of Lakeland will appreciate the background of the story. We do not know that Mr. Walpole always carries us with him as the narrative develops—we cannot imagine that the Judith he introduces to us would have given herself to Warren Forster in the way she did. On the whole, however, *Judith Paris* is Mr. Walpole at his best and does leave one longing for more.

Though, no doubt, we shall be labelled Philistines, we think that Mrs. Virginia Woolf might have assisted readers by prefixing a list of characters to her—what shall we say?—story, narrative, novel? "Novel", we see the jacket calls it, and it goes on to tell us that "each character speaks in soliloquy against the background of the sea". So they do. They begin as children before the sun has risen, and never children spake like these children : in fact, they all speak like Mrs. Woolf. Louis, a schoolboy, says :

> My roots are threaded, like fibres in a flower-pot, round and round about the world.

Jinny (the same age) says :

> Those are yellow words, those are fiery words. I should like a fiery dress, a yellow dress, a fulvous dress to wear in the evening.

And Neville follows :

> Each tense means differently. There is an order in this world; there are distinctions, there are differences in this world, upon whose verge I step. For this is only a beginning.

And so they go on until they grow old while the sun rises in the sky, and then sinks into the western waves. And Bernard's last soliloquy, a summing up which occupies 65 pages of Mrs. Woolf's beautifully finished prose, ends : "Against you I will fling myself, unvanquished and unyielding, O Death !". And then *"The waves broke on the shore".*

Miss Cicely Boas's *The Vicar's Wife* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) is the story of a managing woman, and how her plans went agley. The story is well told, and carries the reader along, though we are not sure the melodrama at the end does not spoil it. The characters of the Vicar and his wife are both admirably drawn, and there is verisimilitude in the description of the work of a squalid London parish. Altogether the novel is far above the average.

We have no grumble against Mr. James Hilton for writing a novel about a Nonconformist minister, but we do grumble that before writing *And Now Goodbye* (Benn, 7s. 6d.) he did not master his material. No Nonconformist at the present day uses terms that Mr. Hilton attributes to them, and his acquaintance with Nonconformity probably is limited to a period in a Nonconformist Sunday School, perhaps twenty or thirty years ago. We do not share the views of those who hold that it is quite impossible that a Nonconformist minister should act in the way in which Howat Freemantle did. Ministers are only human, and it is quite possible that a man of Freemantle's type would react from routine and domesticity and fall suddenly in love with an attractive young person. Mr. Hilton can tell a story, and we hope he will try again, but next time let him be much surer about his atmosphere before he passes his proofs.

We regret that the name of Mr. Gamaliel Milner, the author of *The Problem of Decadence,* was given as Miller in our last issue.

EDITOR.

Dr. Percy Gardner has laid us all under obligation by his books on liberal Christianity, notably *Exploratio Evangelica,* and *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief.* This veteran of the Modernist movement is at the same time its sanest and most devout exponent. In *The Interpretation of Religious Experience* (Williams & Norgate, 6s.) he replies to certain of his critics and re-states his position in positive and practical terms. While making full allowance for the value of the intellectual and emotional presentation of religion he nevertheless argues that

> the practical or ethical approach to reality is the one best adapted to ordinary men and women. It finds that in conduct, in the very act of living, there is a divine Power who works with and through men, and leads men to a recognition of himself as a moral being, and to a recognition of God as the Power who inspires conduct.

This thesis Dr. Gardner defends in terms of Christian faith and experience, setting forth his views of religion as the power of God unto salvation and the means to that higher and fuller life which is the true destiny of all children of men. He writes with the knowledge and caution of mature reflection and lifelong devotion, and his book will be welcomed and should be carefully studied by all those who care for a deeply religious and open-minded presentation of the Christian faith.

Miss M. D. R. Willink admits that *The Holy and the Living God* (Allen & Unwin, 10s.) is one-sided, and it is certainly provocative, though it deals with a subject which needs treatment and is to a certain extent timely. The book is an intensive study of that aspect of the divine which Otto has made familiar under the term "holy", its early manifestations in primitive religion, and its full-blown activity in Judaism and Christianity. The writer makes full but rather uncritical use of the varied material to hand, all with the view of emphasizing the *mysterium tremendum* in God and in His ways with man. The distinction between the holy and the sacred is maintained by the use for the latter of the term "Hallows", and the study of these "Hallows" forms a considerable part of the work. As long as it is realized that the book is admittedly "one-sided", no great fault can be found with it, though, as the writer sees, it needs always the corrective of those final and more spiritual conceptions of the divine for which Christianity stands. It is contended that there is a stern and awful aspect of the teaching and work of Jesus Christ which is too often overlooked, but the omission is not really made good by merely stating it. The teaching of Jesus Christ in regard to the love of God is central, but it is well to remember that God's love is always a holy love and that that means something at once more subtle and more wonderful than the author of this book realizes. At the same time the book's emphasis on the ethical and spiritual aspects of the holy may be regarded as perhaps a needed antidote to a good deal of mushy thought and teaching about the divine which is current in these days.

Dr. E. R. Trattner is an American Jewish Rabbi who has written a well-known book on the Bible from the Jewish standpoint, and in *As a Jew Sees Jesus* (Scribners, 7s. 6d.) he now gives us the story of Jesus Christ, also from the standpoint of a devout and enlightened Jew. The book is a beautiful one and full of insight. It throws, too, much new light on the

sayings and environment of Jesus by putting them in their Jewish setting. Though there is a great deal in it which will not be pleasing to the orthodox, the book may be recommended to Christians of all types as representing a point of view of which they will do well to take account. Dr. Trattner concludes his study with the words :

> I believe that the Jewish world will move toward a progressive appreciation of Jesus in proportion as the Christian world turns its back on the whole abracadabra of medieval theology.

Dr. Shailer Mathews is Dean of the Chicago Divinity School, and one of the best known American theologians. His *The Growth of the Idea of God* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.) consists of a series of lectures on the development of the idea of God, first in primitive religions, and then in Judaism and in Christianity, concluding with two lectures on the place of the idea of God in modern thought. Like all Dr. Mathews's work, the book is sober, scholarly, and well documented. Though it covers a great deal of ground rather rapidly, it is by no means merely sketchy in its treatment, and should prove of great use to students of religion.

Father R. H. J. Stuart's *Temples of Eternity* (Longmans, 5s.) consists of a fine series of devotional studies on man as a spiritual being and on his relation with God. Though the work of a Roman Catholic, they may be read with profit by any Protestant, and they illustrate the truth that there is in experimental religion something which transcends all theological and ecclesiastical differences.

The Rev. J. Merrin's *The Beauty of Jesus* (R.T.S., 3s. 6d.) is a series of studies in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ written from a broadly evangelical standpoint and not without interest and freshness.

The Rev. E. G. Braham's *An Outline of Faith* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.) is intended for Sunday School teachers and youth leaders. It consists of nine clearly written chapters on the great themes of religion and Christianity. It is well up-to-date in its attitude and should prove useful to any thoughtful young student.

The subtitle of Dr. A. Campbell Garnett's *The Mind in Action* (Nisbet & Cambridge Press, 5s. net) describes it as "A Study of Motives and Values", and the description is quite a pertinent one. The book is a most welcome and refreshing contribution to the study of certain aspects of psychology, and a very effective counterblast to behaviourism. Dr. Garnett makes full allowance for the physiological and biological interpretation of life, but he also makes it quite clear that human life is much bigger than its physiology, and that no adequate explanation of it can be given if it is regarded merely as a response to the action of environment. To him mind is a reality, and though he studies the mind mainly in and through action, he never makes the mistake of identifying it with the action in which it is concerned. So we have here a brief but entirely adequate treatment of subjects like Motivation in connexion both with intelligence and feeling, instinct and appetite, habit and sentiment, moral conduct, and the higher values of truth, beauty, and religion. Dr. Garnett is a disciple of James, Webb, Spearman, and McDougall, and in his study of human motives, feelings, and instincts follows the line which these writers have made familiar, though always with independence and a certain measure of originality. His discussion of values is of the greatest importance, and the general results may be summed up in his own words :

> To live is, to the conscious subject, to be a finite centre of experience, seeking cognitively and conatively to penetrate the reality in which it dwells.

> Truth and beauty are experienced in the harmonious progress of the two parts of the cognitive aspect of that activity, moral value is the harmonious experience of the conative aspect of that activity. Religious value is the experience arising when both aspects of that activity are felt to be in harmony with that of the reality they seek to penetrate.

For the evidence on which these statements are based the reader must go to the book itself. He will find in it, in a form almost too compressed, some very sure guidance on the main problems of psychology.

W. B. Selbie.

Mr. Cassius J. Keyser's *Humanism and Science* (Columbia Univ. Press and Milford, 15s.), in which he writes of the relations of Humanism to Science, is a little disconcerting in its self-confidence, and in its complete faith in the ability of man by his own faculties to build a new heaven and a new earth; or perhaps one should say a new earth, for the author seems to banish heaven and God to the limbo of superstitions that have been found out. As I followed the argument I wondered if Mr. Keyser had ever read the pages in the *Apologia* in which Newman speaks of the frustration of all human efforts, and if so, what he thought of it.

The interpretation of Humanism in this book is not the loosened rein of the modern novel, but something ennobling in itself—"the achievement of a good life on this planet by the use of human faculties". Clearly, Mr. Keyser believes that by industry, literature, art, sociology, science, and mathematics—especially the last two—wrought into the stuff of our humanity, man has it in him, if I may use a *N.T.* phrase, "to arise and walk". Archimedes shall henceforth move the world, and without a fulcrum. It is all very interesting if it were not so naïve, so self-deluding in its reading of history, so wide of the reckoning of a far greater than any of ourselves about the deceitfulness of the heart.

But in its essential parts the book is useful. It is sincere; and if it has a rather noisy manner, it is high in its ethical aim. The distinction it makes between mathematics and science is not convincing (though that is little to the present point), and it places inordinate hopes on science and mathematics as saviours (or should one say faculty promoters?) of the race. But the discussion is never dull, and it is a book many ministers will profit by reading. But might I venture this plea with the author—not to use his gifts to pour scorn on great theologies which he evidently does not understand; and above all, to think that in his apparent attitude to the Christian revelation he may possibly be wrong?

In *Science and Human Experience* (Williams & Norgate, 6s.) Prof. Herbert Dingle discusses modern scientific ideas in relation to the varieties of human experience. He has much to say of the "individual" character of many experiences, *e.g.*, religious experience, and of the limitations this individuality imposes on a scientific account of them; since science deals only with experiences which "are actually or potentially common to all normal people". But the crucial point is to define "normal", and much confusion arises in the latter part of the book through the indefiniteness of this term. There is a much greater inter-play of the varieties of experience than the author allows. The purely scientific chapters trace the progress of recent scientific thought from the times of Galileo and Newton to the present day; their clearness is a real achievement, and the main things are admirably put. In his final discussion of religion and science Prof. Dingle wipes from his shield every taint of mysticism and goes out to battle against Sir Arthur Eddington and Sir James Jeans:

If any one wishes to challenge the statement that God does not exist for Science, he must give instructions which one may follow and automatically receive an experience of God.

It sounds too much like the "hard" school.

Dr. Peel's *A Brief History of English Congregationalism* (Indep. Press, 1s.) has been written in connexion with the Centenary of the Congregational Union, and with the younger folk of the denomination specially in mind. It conveys with remarkable freshness the spiritual ideals which have been the life-breath of Congregationalism, and have given our Churches a truly catholic heart and aim. The old adventurous story is told clearly and convincingly; no drum beating, and nothing of the sectarian note. This excellent outline of our history ought to be in the hands of all our young people, and of very many older folk as well. A. T. S. JAMES.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, *ETC.*

Helps to the Study of the Bible. Oxford Press. 8s. 6d. 2nd Ed. With many corrections and additions by the Bishop of Bradford, G. H. Box, C. H. Dodd, G. B. Gray, H. Wheeler Robinson, G. A. Smith, A. Souter, *etc.*

J. H. PENNIMAN. *A Book about the English Bible.* Pennsylvania and Oxford University Presses. 8s. 6d.

P. T. FORSYTH. *The Soul of Prayer.* Sharp. 2s. 6d.

W. H. TURTON. *The Truth of Christianity.* Wells Gardner. 2s. 11th Ed., revised.

J. M. ROBERTSON. *A Short History of Christianity.* Watts. 1s. 3rd Ed., revised and condensed.

ARTHUR VINE HALL. *Round the Camp Fire in East Africa.* Longmans. 4s. 6d. 6th Ed., with 6 new poems.

D. H. LAWRENCE. *The Virgin and the Gipsy.* Martin Secker. 3s. 6d. 3rd Imp. First published 1930. A posthumous novel which lacked the author's final revision.

JANE AUSTEN. *Sense and Sensibility.* Oxford Press. 2s. "World's Classics".

LECTURES, REPORTS, *ETC.*

Keswick Convention, 1931. Pickering. 4s. and 2s. 6d.

Dust of Gold. Popular Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society. B. & F.B.S. 6d.

From Strength to Strength. 132nd Annual Report of the R.T.S.

Solomon Schechter, by Norman Bentwich. Allen & Unwin. 2s. and 1s. Arthur Davis Lecture. Foreword by Professor F. C. Burkitt.

CHRISTOPHER ADDISON. *Religion and Politics.* Sharp. 2s. 6d. Beckly Lecture.

ROBERT STOKES. *The Moral Issue in India.* Murray. 1s. Introduction by Lord Meston. A strong plea that early self-government would be a disaster to India.

A. S. LANGLEY. *The Faith, Heritage, and Mission of the Baptists.* Kingsgate Press. 3d.

S. J. PRICE. *Laymen and Re-union.* Kingsgate Press. 6d.

VISCOUNT CECIL. *A Letter to an M.P. on Disarmament.* Hogarth Press. 1s.

WILLIAM TEMPLE. *Syllabus on Thoughts on some Problems of the Day.* Macmillan. 6d.

The Independent Press has published several of the addresses delivered at the Manchester Meetings, including W. Charter Piggott, *Our Heritage to Youth* (3d.); R. F. Horton. *Things that Abide* (1d.); F. Wrigley, *The Call to Thanksgiving* (3d.); and the addresses of T. T. James, S. M. Berry, and W. C. Bentall together under the title *The Call to Consecration to New Adventure* (4d.).

In the "Lambeth Series" (Nisbet, 1s.) we have: E. A. Burroughs, *The Christian Church and War;* E. H. M. Waller, *The Mission Field;* E. J. Palmer, *The Destiny of the Anglican Churches;* Henry Lunn, *A Free Church Impression.*

A new series issued by the Lindsey Press under the title "Religion: Its Modern Needs and Problems" opens with these four volumes (1s. each): R. V. Holt, *Progress and Christianity;* J. C. Flower, *Religious Experience;* L. J. Belton, *Psychical Research and Religion;* B. Viney, *The Revelation of God in Nature and Humanity.*

ALSO RECEIVED.

A. C. BUCHANAN. *Meditations on the Four Gospels.* S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. "Manuals of the Inner Life" series. Each page is given to a meditation on a few verses with a concluding prayer.

H. S. DARBY. *The Face and the Voice.* Sharp. 3s. 6d.

D. M. D. STUART. *The Revelation of God in the Lord's Prayer.* Stockwell. 7s. 6d.

E. J. JENKINSON. *Christ the Conqueror.* Sharp. 2s. 6d.

MALDWYN L. EDWARDS. *Seeing the Invisible.* Sharp. 2s. 6d.

W. WAKINSHAW. *Gleanings from my Life.* Sharp. 3s. 6d. Racy reminiscences, especially the first part of the volume.

From World Understanding to World Peace. Selected by Hélène Claparède-Spir, Preface by Gilbert Murray, Introduction by David Starr Jordan, Conclusion by Paul Monroe. Williams & Norgate. 6s. 6d. "Voices from the *élite* of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, and the United States."

St. George's Service Book for Schools. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. 35 orders of service for varying occasions and purposes.

Key to and Primer of Interlingua, or "Latin without inflections meant to be used as an international Auxiliary language amongst peoples of various mother tongues". Kegan Paul. 4s. 6d.

LILIAN HUTTON. *Christmas Night and Other Verse.* Stock. 1s.

L. A. BARTER SNOW. *'Twixt Altar and Plough.* 2s. 6d.; BETH J. C. HARRIS. *Gillian's Treasure.* 2s.; JANIE LANGFORD. *The Breath of To-morrow.* 1s. 6d.; L. A. BARTER SNOW. *Aileen.* 1s. 3d.; W. K. WILBERFORCE. *A Twenty Years' Secret.* 1s.; E. E. Enock. *The Lost Inheritance.* 1s. 6d. Pickering.

From MESSRS. PICKERING we have received a selection of Diaries (2s. and 1s.) and Almanacs (1s. 6d. to 1d.). Those who like to combine utility with reminders of spiritual things will find these specially to their taste.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The Holborn Review (Oct.) The Rev. A. D. Martin writes on "Wordsworth and his Critics", Dr. J. Ritson on "George Whitefield", Mr. H. E. Phillips on "The Organ and its Origin", and the Rev. T. W. Bevan on "The Literary Aftermath of the War".

The Hibbert Journal (Oct.). For once in a way Biblical scholarship takes the foremost place: Dr. B. W. Bacon writes on "Reading the Gospels Backward", Prof. A. E. Morris on "What did Jesus Say?", the Rev. R. Rynd on "Bishop Gore on Miracles", and Monsignor Barnes argues that Barnabas wrote *Hebrews*. Among the other articles are the Editor's "The Saving Forces of Civilization", the Rev. E. Shillito's "The Religion of Nationalism", and Dr. Nicol Macnicol's "Religion in Contemporary India".

The London Quarterly Review (Oct.). The Editor writes on his task in editing Wesley's letters, the Rev. W. Bardsley Brash has a sketch of Cowper, Prof. J. A. Faulkner tells "How Hellenism prepared the way", the Rev. A. G. Curnow discusses "Cyprianism and Reunion", and the Rev. S. G. Dimond "Aeschylus".

The Baptist Quarterly (Oct.). This journal has now completed its tenth year. The present number contains many short articles, of which the Rev. W. E. Hough's "The Necessity of Christ for Revelation", and the Rev. L. H. Marshall's "Authority in Religion" may be mentioned.

The Modern Churchman (Aug.-Nov.). The three issues (Aug.-Oct.) are in one volume containing the papers read at the Eighteenth Modern Churchmen's Conference. The subject of the Conference was "Man, His Nature, Civilization, and Prospects". Dean Inge opened with the Presidential Address on "Humanism, Pagan and Christian", and the other papers were read by Sir J. A. Thomson, Mr. M. C. Burkitt, Dr. William Brown, Sir Francis Younghusband, the Revs. C. F. Russell and A. L. Lilley, Sir Arnold Wilson, Canon Major, Canon Raven, Mr. J. A. Fraser Roberts, Sir Oliver Lodge, the Rev. J. S. Bezzant, and the Rev. J. C. Hardwick. There is any amount of matter for study in these varied papers.

The Church Quarterly Review (Oct.). This number opens with an unpublished correspondence of Arsenius of Thebais concerning the attempted union of the Nonjurors with the Orthodox Church (1716-1725). The Bishop of Gloucester's article on Christian Theology is this quarter concerned with "The Bible". Canon Addleshaw's study of John Donne is interesting but disfigured by several misprints. There is a short note on "The Church and Drama" by Mr. E. Martin Browne, and several long reviews.

The Green Quarterly (Oct.). Dr. F. L. Cross asks "Can Modern Life be Christianized ?". Mr. E. O. James writes on "The New Spanish Republic". Father Bede Frost, in "Religion and Daily Life", tells how to face life when coming out of retreat. Canon Underhill writes on "The Priesthood of the Church of England", and there is a story, "Armistice", by Mr. Kenneth Livingston.

The Expository Times (Oct.-Dec.). In "National Contributions to Biblical Science" we have Prof. Viénot's "The Contribution of France to Church History". The "Great Attacks on Christianity" dealt with in these numbers are "Porphyry" (Dr. Moffatt), and "Voltaire" (Dr. W. D. Niven).

Among other articles deserving of study are Dr. G. S. Duncan's "*Philippians*", Canon J. Battersby Harford's "*Ezekiel*", Dr. Dakin's "Psychology of the Presentation of the Gospels", and Dr. Garvie's "Synthesis of History, Experience and Reason in the 'Knowledge of God' ".

The Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Tenth Month). "From the House of the Four Winds" deals with Sir Walter Scott. Among the other articles are C. C. Barnard's "The Influence of Religion upon Public Health", R. G. Lunnon's "The New Outlook of Science", and G. A. Sutherland's "Thoughts on Education".

The International Review of Missions (Oct.). Dr. W. E. Hocking has an important article on "The Ethical Basis Underlying the Legal Right of Religious Liberty". Mr. Arthur Mayhew writes on "The Lindsay Commission", Dr. Baudert on "Thoughts and Reflections on the Education of Africans"; and Dr. Johanssen continues his study of "The Idea of God in the Myths and Proverbs of some East African Bantu Tribes". There is the usual bibliography, and a Ten Years' Index.

World Dominion (Oct.). Mention must first be made of the thrilling report of "Trekking in Central Asia" by Miss Mildred Cable and the Misses French. Dr. R. G. Cochrane describes "The Menace of Leprosy", and the Rev. W. Kendall Gale has a vivid account of "The Story of Ambaravarambato". There are many brief articles about missionary enterprise and the progress of the indigenous movement in different parts of the world.

The British Journal of Inebriety (Oct.). The main papers in this number, which is largely devoted to reviews, are Major General T. W. Russell Pasha's "Drug Addiction in Egypt", and Sir Malcolm Delevingne's "Drug Addiction as an International Problem".

The Evangelical Quarterly (Oct.). The four articles in this number are Dr. W. B. Greene's "The Ethics of the *N.T.*"; Dr. Vollenhoven's "The Significance of Calvinism for the Reformation"; Dr. G. D. Henderson's "Scottish Theological Learning in the Seventeenth Century"; and Dr. J. Veldkamp's "Milton's Philosophy".

The Yale Review (Autumn). A "Coming of Age" number. English readers will probably turn first to Mr. Wickham Steed's "Labor in Office and Opposition", and then to Mr. Thornton Wilder's "Queens of France". There is a long poem by Mr. Edwin Arlington Robinson, "Toussaint l'Ouverture". M. André Maurois's "American Students and French Novels" is disappointing. The award of a prize for the best article during the year goes to Mr. Walter Lippmann.

The Biblical Review (Oct.). Dr. W. M. Paden describes "Missionary Work of the Mormons". Dr. A. R. Wentz discusses "Permanent Deposits of Colonialism in American Christianity", Dr. W. J. McKnight "The Letter to the Laodiceans", and Dr. S. D. Chown "A Search for Reality in Religion". Bishop H. M. Du Bose compares "Humanism—New and Old".

The Anglican Theological Review (Oct.). The most important article is Mr. N. W. Lund's "The Influence of Chiasmus upon the Structure of *Matt.*". (Here is a test for all readers of this journal : "What is Chiasmus?"). Other articles of value are Dr. H. H. Gowen's "The Divine Wisdom" and Mr. W. O. Kinsolving's "Have I a Soul?".

The Review and Expositor (October). Between the opening and the closing articles, the Rev. F. C. Spurr's "The Creator Spirit", and Dr. A. T. Robertson's "The Worship of Jesus in the New Testament", there are four theological articles and Miss Selke's long study of "The Relation of Martin Luther to Evangelical Religion".

Il Pensiero Missionario (Sept. Quarterly Periodical of the Clerical Missionary Union in Italy, Jesuit). This number contains interesting studies of Lao-tse and of Shintoism, also of the *Aurora* Catholic College near Shanghai, with faculties of medicine, law, letters, and science (mining and electrical engineering and astronomy are mentioned). Jesuit Catholicism has its own representative experts in all the fresh avenues of discovery opened up by free thought. Even is own Assyriologists like Father Deimer, Egyptologists like the late Prof. Ernesto Schiaparelli, and its own excavations like Teb-Tunis.